

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVIII, No. 13 }  
WHOLE No. 455 }

JANUARY 5, 1918

{ \$3.00 A YEAR  
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

### Chronicle

**The War.**—With the exception of a violent and partly successful thrust by the Germans on a two-mile front against Welsh Ridge south of Cambrai, no action of any

*Bulletin, Dec. 24,  
a.m.-Dec. 31, p.m.*

importance took place during the week on the Western front. In the Verdun sector German attacks were repulsed between the Caurières. Wood and Bezonvaux. Severe fighting was almost continuous along the Italian lines. Here the Austro-German assault swung back and forth like a pendulum between the Asiago Plateau and the front between the upper Brenta and Piave, with an occasional effort to feel out the weaker spots of their opponents on the lower Piave. On the upper Brenta the main effort of the Austro-Germans is aimed at Valstagna towards which they are making a converging drive from Monte Grappa region to the eastward and down the Val Frenzella from the west. In the Col del Rosso and around Monte Valbella, which after changing hands several times remained in the possession of Field Marshal von Hoetzendorf's troops, the struggle was of the fiercest nature. The Austro-Germans claim to have taken more than 9,000 prisoners. In Palestine General Allenby's troops made another considerable advance north of Jerusalem, driving the Turks back two miles on a front of thirteen miles. Vice-Admiral Sir Rosslyn Wemyss has been appointed First Sea Lord in succession to Sir John R. Jellicoe, who has been elevated to the peerage.

The 275,000 miles of American railways passed under Government control at noon Friday, December 28, when Secretary McAdoo, acting under the President's proclamation became Director-General of Railroads and began to exercise the authority vested in him by the President to finance and direct the transportation facilities of the nation during the war. The President, on December 26, had announced his decision to take possession and assume control of the railroads of the country. In a statement accompanying his proclamation Mr. Wilson declared that as soon as Congress reassembled he would recommend legislation guaranteeing the maintenance of railroad properties in good repair and the payment of a net operating income equal to the net operating income

of the roads for the three years ending June 30, 1917.

The President's proclamation practically mobilizes the railroads of the country and all their appurtenances. While it gives the Government possession of water-lines that figure in rail-and-water transportation, the Government does not intend to take over local water routes and those steamer lines that "do not fit into the rail problem." The Chief Executive's action is based on the authority granted by Congress on August 29, 1916, which made appropriations for the support of the army for the fiscal year, 1917, and which provided that the President in time of war, might take possession or assume control of any or all systems of transportation and utilize them, to the exclusion, as far as may be necessary, of all other traffic, for the transportation of troops, war material and equipment, and for such other purposes connected with the emergency as may be needful or desirable.

In the statement accompanying the official proclamation which announced the coming Federal control of the roads, Mr. Wilson thus gave the main reason for his action:

I have exercised the powers over the transportation system of the country, which were granted to me by the act of Congress of August, 1916, because it has become imperatively necessary for me to do so. This is a war of resources no less than of men, and it is necessary for the complete mobilization of our resources that the transportation systems of the country should be organized and employed under a single authority and a simplified method of coordination which have not proved possible under private management and control.

The President recognizes that the Committee of Railway Executives who cooperated with the Government in the solution of the transportation problems did the utmost that it was possible for them to do, "but there were difficulties which they could neither escape or neutralize." For this reason the full authority of the Government had to be substituted.

In the official proclamation after referring to the enabling resolutions and statutes the President announces the main points of his program as follows:

I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States . . . do hereby, through Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, take possession and assume control at 12 o'clock noon on the twenty-

eighth day of December, 1917, of each and every system of transportation and the appurtenances thereof located wholly or in part within the boundaries of the continental United States and consisting of railroads, and owned or controlled systems of coastwise and inland transportation, engaged in general transportation, whether operated by steam or by electric power, including also terminals, terminal companies and terminal associations, sleeping and parlor cars, private cars and private car lines, elevators, warehouses, telegraph and telephone lines, and all other equipment and appurtenances commonly used upon, or operated as a part of, such rail or combined rail and water systems of transportation—to the end that such systems of transportation be utilized for the transfer and transportation of troops, war material and equipment to the exclusion so far as may be necessary of all other traffic thereon, and that so far as such exclusive use be not necessary or desirable, such systems of transportation be operated and utilized in the performance of such other services as the national interest may require and of the usual and ordinary business and duties of common carriers.

It is hereby directed that the possession, control, operation, and utilization of such transportation systems hereby by me undertaken shall be exercised by and through William G. McAdoo, who is hereby appointed and designated Director-General of Railroads. Said Director may perform the duties imposed upon him so long, and to such extent, as he shall determine, through the boards of directors, receivers, officers, and employes of said systems of transportation. Until and except so far as said Director shall from time to time by general or special orders otherwise provide, the boards of directors, receivers, officers, and employes of the various transportation systems shall continue the operation thereof in the usual and ordinary course of the business of common carriers in the names of their respective companies.

Until so ordered by the Director-General of Railroads these systems of transportation remain subject to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The proclamation, for the present, does not affect street electric passenger railways. The rights of stockholders, bondholders, creditors having interests in the now-Federal-controlled transportation systems are not impaired. The regular dividends hitherto declared and maturing interest upon bonds, debentures and other obligations may be paid in due course.

Everywhere the question is asked whether the policy now adopted by the Government, if successful, will be the forerunner of Government unified control, or perhaps, Government ownership of railroads after the war.

The following is the substance of the statement offering terms for a general peace which Count Czernin made on Christmas Day at the Russo-German conference at

*The Czernin Peace Terms* Brest-Litovsk: The delegations of the Allied (Teutonic) Powers in the name of their Governments and peoples

will conclude a general peace as soon as possible and think that the basic principles of the Russian delegation can be made its basis; the delegations are agreed to conclude immediately a general peace without forcible annexations and indemnities and condemn the continuation of the war for purposes of conquest; the Teutonic Powers and their allies solemnly declare their resolve immediately to sign terms of peace on the above terms equally just to all belligerents; the proposals of the Russian

delegations could be realized only in the case all the belligerents promise scrupulously to observe these terms; the Powers of the Quadruple Alliance, negotiating with Russia, cannot one-sidedly bind themselves to these terms, without having the guarantee that Russia's allies will carry them out honestly. The terms, under these conditions, are thus stated: Forcible annexation of territory seized during the war is not intended; it is not the intention of the Allies (Teutonic) to deprive of political independence those nations which lost it during the war; "the question of subjection to that or the other country of those nationalities who have not political independence cannot, in the opinion of the Powers of the Quadruple Alliance, be solved internationally; each Government must solve it with its peoples according to its Constitution"; the protection of the rights of minorities constitutes an essential component part of the constitutional rights of peoples to "self-determination"; the Allied Powers (of the Quadruple Alliance) have admitted the possibility that both sides might renounce not only indemnification for war costs, but for war damages; in these circumstances, every belligerent Power would have to make indemnification only for its nationals who have become prisoners of war, as well as for damage done in its own territory by illegal acts of violence committed against civilian nationals belonging to the enemy. The Russian Government's proposal for the creation of a special fund for this purpose could be considered only if the other belligerent Powers join in the peace negotiations within a suitable period; the return of colonial territories forcibly seized during the war constitutes an essential part of the German demands, which Germany cannot renounce under any circumstances; the Russian demand for immediate evacuation of territories occupied by an adversary conforms to German intentions, having in view the nature of the colonial territories of Germany, the realization of the right of self-determination, in the form proposed by the Russian delegates is at present impossible; the fidelity shown by the natives of the German colonies to Germany in the struggle is a proof of their intention of retaining their allegiance to Germany and in significance and weight is a proof far superior to any expression of popular will; the principles of economic relations proposed by the Russian delegations are approved by the Allied (Teutonic) Powers who see in the reestablishment of regulated economic relations one of the most important conditions for bringing about friendly relations between the Powers now at war.

The New York *World* sees "Prussianism in its most subtle form in Count Czernin's dubious phrases relative to the solution internationally of the problems of peoples not now independent politically," and adds that the "despotism that craftily offers this travesty of a truce peace does not have the courage or the honesty to propose it in its own name. It hides behind a vassal in Vienna and a mob in Petrograd." The New York *Tribune* says that the terms are "inadmissible because

they make no provision for the restoration of Belgium and Northern France." The Providence *Journal* designates them "a proposal put forward by fools for consumption by children." The Chicago *Tribune* states that "such a German peace would be a substantial German victory." The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* questions the sincerity of the proceeding and says that there are "enough qualifications, evasions and ambiguities in the Teutonic peace terms to spoil their superficial attractiveness." In the French Chamber of Deputies, Foreign Minister Pichon rejected any peace "based on the *status quo*." In a letter to the National Labor Congress Lloyd George stated that Great Britain's intentions in continuing the war are not imperialistic or vindictive but concern the future freedom and peace of the world. The majority of the London papers rejects the Czernin proposals. The *Times* and the *Daily Mail* hold that they constitute a trap for the Allies. The *Express* and a few others think that behind Czernin's words there is a sincere desire for peace and that the offer is genuine.

**Ireland.**—Under the leadership of the tireless and clever De Valera Sinn Fein is still progressing in Ireland. During the week numerous meetings were held in different parts of the country.

**Sinn Fein** The largest of these was convened in Cork where De Valera again stated the aims of the party. The *Irish Weekly Independent* reports him as follows:

Their aims, he said, were to secure recognition for Ireland as a sovereign independent State. He reminded them that Grattan compelled the British Government to recognize his claims by the Volunteers. Referring to the Peace Conference, he said there was only one section of Irishmen who could go there, and they would go there because they proclaimed they were a nation kept under subjection, which the Allies had put before the people as the reason for the present terrible war.

Proceeding, he charged, in connection with the Irish party influence in the Volunteer movement, that when they got control they pretended they were going to arm them, while in private they were arranging to get arms out of the country. They (the Sinn Feiners) were told they were preventing conciliation with the North. The people of Cork knew what the opinions of the Irish party in regard to conciliation were when the question was raised by another party. When Mr. Dillon raised an "ullagone" about the treatment the Irish people had given their leaders, he contradicted himself. Mr. Dillon said that for thirty years they were the trusted leaders; but the fact that the people had now turned against their leaders was significant. Having trusted them for thirty years, there was some deep reason why they should now turn against them. It is a hard fight, added Mr. de Valera, but the difficulties in no way daunt you or me. Our path is sure; it is difficult, but it is straight.

Proceeding the speaker deprecated the Convention, denounced those who were attempting to bring down ecclesiastical condemnation on his head and promised assistance to labor. Sinn Feiners are in high glee over the following letter sent by Bishop Fogarty to the *Irish Times*:

Sir, you have been very busy of late lecturing the Irish Hierarchy on the duties of their sacred office. In yesterday's issue you seem to have extended your disinterested tuition to the great Archbishop of Melbourne, the Most Rev. Dr. Mannix, this time, indeed, not in the guise of a "Bridgetown Farmer," but behind the coat-tails of that hard-pressed Australian politician, Mr. Hughes. Your readers may not be aware that the Most Rev. Dr. Mannix is one of the most distinguished of living Irishmen. He is also one of the greatest and most glorious of our churchmen. He occupies in the spacious mind of Australia a position not unlike that which the renowned Cardinal Moran held there at the time of his death. What is it in the conduct of the Most Rev. Dr. Mannix that has aroused the wrath of Mr. Hughes and the *Irish Times*? His attitude on the question of conscription?

We have here, not an isolated, but an additional instance of the revolting inconsistency, not to say hypocrisy, preached by the avowed champions of "liberty and democracy." Conscription is, I understand, an open question in Australia. It is being made a subject of referendum to the people. Every man in Australia is entitled to say yes or no on that important subject, according to his lights, without the imputation of corruption, sedition, "German gold," or "dirty work." Yes; everyone but a Catholic Archbishop. He and his countrymen are to be treated with insult and injury when tyranny has a free hand; but they are expected, it would seem, to act as the bulwarks of unjust government when tyranny "is set with its back to the wall." Dr. Mannix is too big and brave a man to be intimidated by injustice or falsehood. He claims the right as a member of the human family to say what he thinks of this awful war and of the policy of those who will make a shambles of the world, but will not risk a hair of their own heads in the horrid carnage.

That is the Archbishop's first offense. His second is that he seems to have become a "Sinn Feiner." If so, this is the greatest boon that Sinn Fein has got since the illustrious Dr. O'Dwyer, Bishop of Limerick, was laid in his grave. Dr. Mannix is the last man in the world to patronize either "madness" or "wickedness." All true Irishmen will rejoice to know on your authority that the national instincts of our race are as potent in this great Archbishop in far-away Australia as they are in the humblest peasant at home in Ireland. Sinn Fein has neither English nor German gold to finance it, nor does it want it. It is a natural growth in the national heart, and no power on earth can kill it. It is no longer a small section. In the main it embraces our race all over the world. They, the Sinn Feiners, want neither disorder nor bloodshed; but they are done with "the happy entente" which existed for the fooling of Ireland between English Ministers and our Parliamentary Party; and they think that the time has come for Ireland to get back the national independence of which she was shamefully robbed by England 117 years ago.

But this is but one side of the shield: the other side shows opposition to Sinn Fein. Thus for instance the *Weekly Freeman* continues its vigorous attacks on De Valera, picturing him as dangerous if not actually seditious. In a recent issue the same paper reprinted from the *Irish Opinion* an editorial in which labor negatived De Valera's request that it wait for freedom before pressing its claims too insistently. According to the latter paper labor "will claim its share of patrimony when and where opportunity offers." Thus a new complication is added to an already complicated problem.

**Mexico.**—Riot and robbery are still in order in Mexico. The several revolutionary leaders are still in

the field making a mockery of the frantic statements of Carranza that all is well under his *Riot and Robbery* benign rule. Recently the *Wall Street Journal* printed this very instructive article under the title "T. E. Gibbon Exposes Mexican Confiscation":

T. E. Gibbon, in an article on the Mexican constitution in the December issue of the *Journal of the American Bankers' Association*, gives the first clear record of national bank looting in Mexico to illustrate the broad confiscatory powers for looting foreign-owned property in that country conferred by the I. W. W. Constitution on the Carranza Government and its officials. He says:

There is not only no hope that conditions in Mexico that have resulted in the destruction of foreign business in that country will be ameliorated, but every promise that they will grow worse as time goes on unless the United States Government shall make up its mind to require the Government in Mexico, which it has recognized as a member of the family of nations, to live up to its obligations under international law in the treatment given by it to the persons and property of our nationals, and those of our Allies, within its borders.

As showing the predatory attitude of the Carranza Government toward the property of foreigners in Mexico in the past, and indicating what foreign interests in Mexico may expect from that Government in the future, the history of its relations to the Bank of London & Mexico, a large financial institution in Mexico City representing English capital, may be cited.

On July 31 *El Universal*, a prominent daily newspaper of Mexico, published the annual report of the board of directors of that bank. This publication said:

"It was then reported that of the amount of more than 19,000,000 pesos in gold and silver in bars and coin money which had been in the bank's vaults, there had been slowly taken away from January 18, 1917, until the present time, the sum of over 17,000,000 pesos, there remaining in the vaults, according to information received by the board of directors, only about 2,000,000 pesos. In the report it was stated that the board of directors [a board appointed by and representing the Carranza Government] ordered that the cash department and the safes should always remain open, which measure obliged the board of directors to put a corps of employees on guard in this department, day and night, to avoid responsibility for abstraction of funds from the vaults falling on those not responsible.

"The board stated categorically that of the \$19,611,141 in specie which were in the vaults of the bank, hardly \$2,000,000 remain, as the board of receivers had disposed of the difference, and that the said board of receivers has sold at the lowest of prices, securities considered first class by the bank.

"That on February 15, 1917, the Department of Finance refused to recognize the bank's board of directors, refusing to take up any matter connected with the institution with them, and ordered that the board of receivers liquidate the bank.

"Mention was made of a communication from the Department of Finance in October last year, asking for delivery to the mint of the bars of metal which the bank had in vault, and a message from the Sub-Secretary of Finance was annexed, sent from Queretaro to the manager of the bank, categorically stating that the money coined therefrom would be returned to the bank; and it was reported that notwithstanding this assurance given by the Sub-Secretary of Finance, compliance with this written offer has never been made.

"Finally it was stated that of 820 silver bars, taken by the Government, worth more than 1,000,000 pesos, national gold, and eighty gold bars worth 1,840,119 pesos, to be coined by the mint, they have returned to the bank, in the breach of the offer made from Queretaro by the Sub-Secretary of Finance, only 299,675 pesos for the silver bars and 200,000 pesos for the gold bars, causing the bank a deficit of 2,697,387 pesos."

There is every reason to believe that the State Governments in their relation to foreign-owned investments, will follow the same course. We know that at the present time the Governors of the various Mexican States are almost all men who have reached some prominence in the military forces of the Carranza party. The character of these men appears to be very fairly indicated in a series of articles, lately published by Luis Cabrera, Secretary

of Finance, in *El Universal* in the City of Mexico, which it appears were provoked by accusations that he and his friends had profited by his control of the national finances. In these articles, while admitting that large sums of money have come into the possession of military officials of the revolution as a result of robbery and confiscation of properties, he denies that this money had found its way into the national or State treasuries.

In his explanation, Secretary Cabrera shows how this was done by the commanders of revolutionary forces:

"By disposing of articles other than money, such as furniture, automobiles or real estate, for personal use or for profit.

"During the Constitutionalists' revolution, the case has been repeated, with unfortunate frequency, under the pretext of confiscating 'intervened' properties, and great quantities of private property have been seized in the beginning for the nation, but the confiscators have used them for personal profit or sold them for money. It is unnecessary to bring proofs of this, for, unfortunately, almost all of the confiscation of the enemies' properties, with honorable exceptions, have been made with the deliberate intention of converting the goods for private use. This goes from the mere 'loan' of a horse or saddle, from the requisition of grain and fodder which are not used for the troops, to the occupation of houses, property and ranches which have been confiscated and were cultivated and exploited directly for the benefit of the confiscator."

In the above quotation we have the estimate, made by a leading revolutionist and prominent national official, of the leaders, with a few exceptions, of the Carranza party now in power in Mexico—the men who are, and will be, most prominent in the national and State governments of that country.

The truth about Mexico is gradually prevailing.

**Russia.**—The internal state of Russia continues to grow worse, and fighting keeps on in the Ukraine. A dispatch dated December 21 reported that victorious

#### *Civil War Goes On*

Cossacks entered Odessa after a six days' battle with the Bolsheviks who lost some 1,800 men in killed and wounded. Later advices say the Bolshevik troops refused to attack the Ukrainians and allowed themselves to be disarmed. From Petrograd chaotic conditions are reported. Several prominent Social Revolutionists have proclaimed their determination not to submit to Premier Lenine but to convene the Constituent Assembly. Divisions have also taken place in the Peasants' Congress which has been in session at Petrograd, one faction insisting that all power be given the Constituent Assembly and the other maintaining that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Delegates should be supreme. Plundering and fighting in the streets of the capital have continued. Colonel Kolpashnikoff, of the American Red Cross Mission, had his house raided, was himself imprisoned, and was accused by Trotsky of favoring the Anti-Bolshevik party, and of helping Kaledine by forwarding supplies to Rostov. Ambassador Francis denies the charges, for if anti-Bolsheviks were approached by the Red Cross it was because they were the only authorities with whom it was then possible to deal. The navy seems as badly disorganized as the army. Eight-hundred officers of the Baltic fleet resigned after protesting against the supreme command of the warships being put into the hands of elected sailors. The latter declared the commission of Admiral Razvosoff revoked and lowered his flag. Southern Russia however seems to be successfully arrayed against the Bolsheviks, whose power is waning, according to the correspondent of the *London Daily News*.

# Security Against the Workman's Hazards

EDWIN V. O'HARA, LL.D.

**I**F sufficiency of income for normal human life is the first condition for the alleviation of labor's unrest, security against the hazards of industrial life for the workman and his family is the second. These hazards are many: they are especially burdensome upon the wage-earner; they are such that he is unable to insure himself against them; their effect is to plunge him and his family into a state of destitution, a land from whose bourne few travelers return. Security against these hazards must be provided by industry through the direction of civil society which otherwise must bear the burden of those who are thrown into the human scrap-heap of industry.

Whatever causes an interruption of the worker's income or constitutes an abnormal drain upon it must be viewed as a special menace to his family. One class of these hazards, namely, industrial accidents, has been finally taken into account by most American States, and accident insurance, so-called workmen's compensation, has become a familiar feature in our industrial organization. But accidents are by no means the only, nor yet the chief hazards of the workman's life. Extraordinary demands are made upon his income by the death of members of the family and by the birth of members into the family. Deaths and births are both expensive items in the laborer's family, and provision for them cannot be made on a mere "decent subsistence wage." A respectable funeral for his dead is the legitimate ambition of every self-respecting laborer. In fact most of the petty insurance carried in this country by the laboring classes is meant to provide decent burials. The poor will make every sacrifice to be saved the humiliation of a pauper's grave for their loved ones. Still, in New York City, after private charity has done its best, one out of every twelve who die, is buried at public expense.

The family, not the individual, is the unit of society, and birth is the chief incident in family life. As I have said, it is also one of the most costly. However eugenists may dispute, the necessity for births in the workingman's family will not be questioned by those who are keen for the maintenance of an adequate labor supply. But the birth cost in the homes of laboring men is little appreciated by the general public. In the first place, a large percentage of the births in these homes is a flat economic loss, to put it on the lowest plane, because out of the 2,500,000 babies born annually in this country, 300,000 die in the first year of life, chiefly in the homes of the poor, and because, too, there is no proper provision for their nourishment, medical and nursing care. But the cost does not end here. Each year 15,000 mothers die from almost entirely preventable diseases caused by childbirth. There is a larger toll of deaths from childbirth among women be-

tween fifteen and forty-four years of age, than that taken by any disease except tuberculosis. Besides the mothers who die and leave the laborer's children to grow up without maternal care, how many other thousands of mothers are unnecessarily disabled by lack of medical care in childbirth and become a burden instead of a help! To discuss the mortality of infants and the loss of a mother's health in terms of economic waste seems cold-blooded, but under no other aspect will these things touch the heart of the pachydermatous giant of modern industry.

Birth and death make an extraordinary demand on the laborer's income; old age and sickness interrupt the income. No one is more worthy of our pity than the man who has spent the best years of his life working steadily in industrial employment, and who, with his meager savings exhausted and his earning power gone, now faces the years of senescence as a burden upon relatives or upon the charity of strangers, his steps dogged by a great fear, the fear of the poor-house. He has given to industry his all, the best years of his productive manhood and this is his reward. Can we wonder if he is bitter? Can we wonder if others manifest an unrest when they see in his conditions of decline a prophecy of their own unhappy fate?

But the hazards we have been dealing with are only incidental compared with the hazard of sickness as a source of poverty. No informed person will contradict the statement that second only to insufficient income, sickness is the greatest individual source of destitution. Sidney and Beatrice Webb say that it is greater than all other sources combined. The recent Commission on Industrial Relations reports that each of the 30,000,000 workers in this country loses annually an average of about nine days on account of illness alone. "Much attention is now given to accident prevention," declares the Commission, "yet accident causes only one-seventh as much destitution as does sickness." It is only among the poorly paid group of laborers that sickness becomes a tragedy. Yet it is precisely among these that disease is most prevalent. "It is an accepted fact," says Dr. Irving Fisher, "that the sickness-rate prevailing among the poor is from two to three times that prevailing among the well-to-do."

Much light has been thrown in late years on the specific industrial causes of disease. They resolve themselves into harmful substances and harmful conditions. Among the harmful substances are poisonous metals and noxious gases, vapors, fumes and dust. Phosphorus, lead, mercury and arsenic poisonings are now familiar to the public. So many diseases are traceable to poisons which affect the workers in scores of occupations that it has been stated by a well-known authority that there is scarcely any one

line of modern manufacture which is free from the dangers of industrial poisoning.

A vast amount of sickness among workers is due to conditions surrounding their employment. Heat, moisture, cold, bad ventilation, overcrowding, compressed air, and excessive or deficient light may be noted as having a deleterious effect on the workman's health. Over-fatigue incident to long hours of labor, or to the speeding-up processes of specialized occupations or to the unregulated piece-rate system has created a "new strain" in modern industry which predisposes the worker to tuberculosis and other diseases, as well as actively causes injurious consequences to the nervous system and special senses. The following account of shovelers in the zinc mines of the Joplin district, Missouri, gives a picture which would be recognized in many fields of industry:

They had shoveled from two to six years; some had started when 18 or 19 years of age. Now they could shovel only 35 or 40 cans, where formerly they could shovel 60 to 70 and upward. Constant work had broken these men down so that at the ages of 22 to 30 they were already on the down grade. . . . Working thus at their full earning capacity, day in and day out, it is not surprising that with the added exposure to rock dust, these men should contract tuberculosis to an excessive degree. Especially must this be true when they start in while under age and before their bodies have fully developed.

It is unnecessary to elaborate further the hazards which surround the workingman and his family. They are beyond his power to ward off or insure against. It may be suggested that the average income of working families is adequate to pay for insurance against a considerable number of these risks. So it is; but more than half of the laboring population get less than the average. The "average man" is an abstraction, but the millions who get less than a decent subsistence-income are real human beings, with wives and little babies. These are the multitude whom destitution is staring in the face. As a matter of fact, only about five per cent of the workmen carry insurance of any sort.

The remedy will be the universal compulsory insurance

of the workingman against the hazards of sickness, old age, death and maternity by the action of the State. America is the only modern industrial nation which has neglected the conservation of its human resources. It is to be hoped that the shortage of labor caused by the war will give a strong impulse to this vital movement. We usually cherish those things which are scarce and are prodigal of things that are plenty. It has been said that in older civilizations when slaves were plenty their masters worked them to death and easily replaced them with others, but when slaves were scarce severe laws were passed against inhuman treatment of them. Now that labor is scarce, Christian principles may be able to invoke cooperation of industrial self-interest to prevent further depletion of the labor supply.

Just as accident insurance gave rise to the "safety-first" movement and diminished the number of accidents—because it was to the interest of industry to diminish the cost of insurance—so also health insurance will not only indemnify the worker who is sick, but will initiate a great movement for the elimination of the causes of disease and death. It is said that forty-two per cent of the deaths now occurring in this country are unnecessary. That is, 630,000 lives could be saved annually by the application of known methods. Such a saving would add fifteen years to the average duration of human life in the United States. During thirty years of the operation of health insurance in Germany, twelve years were added to the average life span of the worker.

Nothing is more provocative of restlessness than insecurity. It is utterly hopeless to establish industrial peace without providing for the security of the workingman and his family against the imminent perils that threaten to engulf him in poverty and destitution. Until this is done men may cry "Peace! Peace!" but there will be no peace. If all the influence of the Catholic Church in America were enlisted in this cause the Church would add another title to her glorious claim to be friend and mother to those who toil and are heavily burdened.

## The Code of Canon Law

JOHN J. CREAGH, J.U.D., S.T.L.

ON the feast of Pentecost, 1917, his Holiness Pope Benedict XV in his constitution "*Providentissima Mater*" gave to the world a pronouncement of the highest importance, one that will keep his name in remembrance as long as the Church endures, for he therein promulgated the code of canon law which had been so eagerly looked for in recent years. Naturally, among Catholics a high degree of interest attaches to this new-born code, and this interest motives the two brief articles here begun, the first of which will aim at giving a general idea of the new legislation,

while the second will deal with some aspects of it, that particularly concern the laity.

Probably no better brief definition of the code can be given than that it is a complete restatement of the law of the Catholic Church. And this description, implying as it does that we have here a collection of ordinances that are new and yet old, indicates a reason why the code will command attention from others than Catholics. For in this legislation of the twentieth century mighty influences of the past live on, altered in form but unchanged in substance, rich in material for the study of

men of every faith. Here in modern vesture is the same venerable law that transformed barbarism into civilization, that curbed despots and spoke encouragement to peoples, that breathed the spirit of Christianity into individuals and families and States. The historian, the sociologist, the investigator of political institutions see here the law to whose texts they have learned to turn as to the richest of sources. Most of all the lawyer feels himself its debtor; for, if his law be but a modernized Roman law, he knows that it was canonists who kept alive the *Ius Civile* and transmitted it to the nations, and if he live in a common-law country he cannot forget that—to use the words of so high an authority as Maitland—"English law was rationalized under the influence of the canon law, and it was by 'popish clergymen' that our English common law was converted from a rude mass of customs into an articulate system."

A restatement of Catholic Church law, then, the code is, and such restatement was confessedly required. The legal renaissance of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries had borne fruit in the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, a kind of code, though far from what today is understood by that term and utterly unlike the code promulgated by Benedict XV. Even if the *Corpus* had been perfect, its latest document followed the current of law only to the fifteenth century. The flow of enactments still continued. Centuries brought an almost endless volume of Papal constitutions, of canons and decrees and decisions and instructions. The student of law, seeking its sources, was compelled to make many a weary journey, to retrace his steps again and again, and often at the end of his labor to rely on the word of a commentator rather than on the law itself. Everyone, moreover, was aware that in the great mass of existing law there was much that was obsolete or contradictory or extremely difficult of actual application.

Perhaps the best evidence of the degree to which the need of restatement was felt can be discovered in documents bearing on the Vatican Council. A reform of canon law, its necessity, its method, its feasibility, constituted a principal matter of study and discussion from 1865, when preparations for the Council were begun, until its sessions closed in 1870. Many bishops, from every country of Europe and from some parts of America, addressed memorials to the Holy See, setting forth in vigorous language what they represented to be the intolerable condition of ecclesiastical law, and urging either a revision of the *Corpus* or the preparation of an entirely new code. Their insistence was so successful that some practical outcome seemed possible when the events occurred which compelled the prorogation of the Council. It may well be doubted, however, whether in any case an ecumenical council could hope to do more than initiate a work of this kind and indicate the broad lines which it ought to follow.

The idea which had been brought forward so prominently in the Council began almost immediately to assert

itself in practice. Laws subsequently made put on a new form, ordinarily appearing in brief paragraphs or articles, disencumbered of superfluous verbiage, and this code-form, as it may be called, was applied to the revision of the law in several of its important departments. Two manifest examples of this new tendency are to be found in the constitution of Leo XIII, "*Officiorum ac Munerum*," reforming the law of the Index, and in the decree "*Conditae a Christo*," in which the same Pontiff codified the law regarding religious with simple vows. But in spite of these and other essays in partial codification, we seemed as far off as ever from the desired official restatement of the entire body of ecclesiastical law. Such a project daunted even the boldest advocates of reform. In fact some of the greatest of modern canonists held that the most that could reasonably be hoped for was a kind of piece-meal revision, which should go on its slow way until the whole field had been covered.

There was some warrant in history for this timorousness in face of so gigantic a task. Some 300 years ago four Popes in succession, Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, Clement VIII and Paul V had applied themselves to a much less ambitious undertaking, an official continuation of the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, a commission assigned to the work had completed its task, and the only outcome had been the refusal of Pontifical approval to the "*Liber Septimus Decretalium*," which has been reedited in recent years as an interesting monument of failure in a field where success was as difficult as it was desirable. And yet Cardinal Pinelli and his commission had set about the making not of a code, but of something far less comprehensive, a compilation bridging only a brief span in the life of the Church.

Lapse of time, especially as this time had to be measured by centuries, naturally increased the difficulty of codification, but equally brought home its advisability. Leo XIII listened with sympathy to suggestions that at least a beginning be made, but, realizing what years of labor must precede any successful result, believed that the glory of the new code was not for his pontificate. So it was left for Pius X to do for canon law, not only what no Pope had ever done, but what no Pope had ever attempted to do. The only thing at all comparable with the design of Pius is the work of Justinian in regard to the law of Rome, but even this comparison halts, for the present *Codex Iuris Canonici* is something more than a selection of texts disposed in more or less orderly fashion, and it renews the law of an empire older and farther extended than that of Rome.

Pope Pius, like Justinian, made possible a mighty work, but we all know that popes and emperors do not single-handed make a code of their own science and labor. Justinian's hopes were realized only because he could rely on the learning and zeal of his great law-minister Tribonian, and Pius X was happy in finding another Tribonian in the present Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri. Many others, of course, collaborated,

cardinals, bishops, consultors, lay and cleric—but the main burden was borne by this distinguished canonist whose influence and learning guided so novel and arduous an endeavor to success. Benedict XV, at the secret consistory of December 4, 1916, in an unusual tribute of praise openly acknowledged this fact.

Initiated by Pius X in a constitution given on March 19, 1904, the work of codification went forward systematically and without interruption. In supreme control was placed a commission of cardinals, of which the Pope retained the presidency; to this was added a body of consultors representing the best legal talent of the Church; the Bishops of the world were invited to forward to Rome the recommendations based on their experience, and moreover as each book of the code was tentatively completed a copy was sent to every bishop in order that final corrections might be made. In a surprisingly short time, after twelve years of painstaking, unremitting labor, the vast undertaking which not a few had deemed impossible of accomplishment, was completed. The term epoch-making, often enough misused, may appropriately be applied to the volume which Benedict XV now places in our hands.

For we have here a document which is the first of its kind in the long history of the Church. Take up any other collection of church law and you are confronted with a treatise like that of Gratian, or a series of constitutions and decided cases as in the Decretals of Gregory IX; you find the law only after disentangling it from much that is not law: you are disappointed that one compiler was content to group his materials simply in order of time, or that another striving at logical arrangement was satisfied with only a small measure of success. But here you find only law, admirably stated in brief, intelligible language, arranged in orderly sequence and under perfectly logical heads. Here, for the first time, is the entire law and not the law of a period. Here, too, for the first time we have a code in the actual sense of the term, like in form to the modern codes adopted by so many nations since France set an example in the Code Napoléon.

Novel, therefore, in a real sense this latest compilation is; but at the same time we must not forget what was said at the outset, that the code while new is yet old. A society like the Church, ancient but eternally renewing her youth, and whose law is mainly the expression of a life that in its essential features is unchanging, cannot be expected to sponsor any large legal innovations. Such changes as come through force of circumstances will always be only in form and in accidental details, never in what we must regard as the substantial, organic law of the Church. Unless one bear this in mind, he will open the new code too expectant of novelty, and will be disappointed.

It is the innovations of the code, nevertheless, that provoke our curiosity. Grouped together they are, in addition to the deleting effect on all other laws and col-

lections of law; (1) the restating of all current law in brief articles or canons; (2) the exclusion of everything but law; (3) some alterations of preexisting legislation and some entirely new provisions, of varying importance; (4) the elimination of all obsolete and conflicting enactments; (5) the uniform simplicity and definiteness of the Latin text. To the canonist every one of these is significant. The layman will probably find them—apart from their value as giving a good general description of the code—of very unequal interest. His chief concern will be to know in what terms the law speaks to him. And if, to satisfy his curiosity, he take up a copy of the new law book, he may well judge the enumeration given above, regarded merely as a description, to be strikingly defective in regard to one particular—call it innovation or what you will—for it is surely worthy of mention that the law of the Catholic Church has been gathered into one comparatively small, well-printed octavo volume of only 448 pages.

## The English in Jerusalem, 1841-1917

EDWIN RYAN, D.D.

OF all the amazing news that is coming to us these days in such abundance as well-nigh to dull our sense of the wonderful, perhaps no item strikes the imagination more forcibly and summons up livelier memories than that the English are in Jerusalem. A new chapter is added to a story that was ancient when Christ was born and that possesses for humanity an interest rivaled only by that of the other sacred city on the Tiber. Indeed, rivaled is a misleading word in this connection, for are not the two linked by the bond of the Old Dispensation with the New? And were not the Popes the vitalizing spirit of the Crusades, those heroic ventures of faith whose superb idealism puts to shame the shallow "practicality" and selfishness of our own day? Nor can we forget such names as James, Helen, Cyril, Epiphanius, and many another, that cling to the city which thrilled at the sound of David's harp, was dazzled by the glory of Solomon and lived in the hope of weeping exiles in Babylon, the City of the Temple of the Living God where, after generations and centuries of the slaughter of sheep and of goats, was consummated the sacrifice of that Spotless Victim whose blood cleanseth us of all sin. However, it is not on these holy themes that I write. My purpose at present is to recall an event that at first may appear to have no interest for Catholics, an affair so grotesquely ridiculous that one feels almost irreverent in mentioning it at all, after suggesting the golden visions of Jewish and of Christian achievement. But one of the lessons the Catholic student of history must learn is that nothing may safely be despised, for God can make anything, even absurdity, minister unto His glory. And there comes upon us a feeling of awe that drowns any inclination to laughter when we remind ourselves that the con-

certed attempt of England and Prussia years ago to plant themselves and their religion in the Holy City helped to bring Newman into the Catholic Church.

The story in brief is this: Back in the thirties of the last century the Government of the Kingdom of Prussia conceived the plan of uniting the Lutheran and the Calvinist bodies in its dominions into a new national church. Certain changes were to be introduced, among others an improved form of episcopacy; for the Prussians knew that a church with bishops appointed by the State is more easily controlled than any other kind. Now this was something in the nature of an experiment and had to be gone through with care; so Prussia set about finding a way to attempt it without involving too great a risk of trouble in case of failure. At last she hit on a plan. In those days Prussia and England, far from being enemies, were filled with admiration for each other, conceiving themselves the bulwarks of vigorous northern Protestantism against the Popery of effete Southern Europe. Hence when the former Prussia wanted a model and helper in a religious enterprise to whom should she go but to her codefender of the Gospel? The matter was discussed by the two Governments with the result that in 1841 the British Parliament passed a bill providing for the consecration of

British subjects, or the subjects or citizens of any foreign State, to be Bishops in any foreign country, whether such foreign subjects or citizens be or be not subjects or citizens of the country in which they are to act, and . . . without requiring such of them as may be subjects or citizens of any foreign kingdom or State to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and the oaths of due obedience to the Archbishop for the time being . . . [and] that such Bishop or Bishops, so consecrated, may exercise, within such limits, as may from time to time be assigned for that purpose in such foreign countries by Her Majesty, spiritual jurisdiction over the ministers of British congregations of the United Church of England and Ireland, and over such other Protestant Congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his or their authority.

Back of this technical legal phraseology was an agreement that England and Prussia were to take turns in appointing a bishop in a foreign country, the bishop to be a sort of link between the Prussian and the English Churches, and, if the scheme worked well, it would be fairly easy for Prussia to use it as an entering wedge for episcopal organization at home. A region at a safe distance was sought and perhaps on the principle *Fiat experimentum in corpore vili* the enlisted powers chose, of all places on earth, Jerusalem!

The absurdity of the whole business is apparent at once to a Catholic; it was painfully apparent to Newman. As he put it:

We have not a single Anglican in Jerusalem, so we are sending a Bishop to make a communion, not to govern our people. Next, the excuse is, that there are converted Anglican Jews there who require a Bishop; I am told there are not half-a-dozen. . . . Thirdly, for the sake of Prussia, he (the Bishop) is to take under him all the foreign Protestants who will come;

and the political advantages will be so great, from the influence of England, that there is no doubt they *will* come. They are to sign the Confession of Augsburg, and there is nothing to show that they hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

Of course the Anglican Bishops tried to hush the matter up but that only increased the disgust of the Oxford group. These argued: If it is wrong to approach more closely to Catholic Rome, the Patriarchal See of the West, why is it not wrong to fraternize with Protestant Berlin? And how is one to defend the "catholicity" of the Anglican Church when she allies herself with an avowedly Protestant body and takes under her protection persons whose creed is worlds away from Apostolic and Patristic tradition? The difficulty is stated by Newman himself in the "Apologia" (American edition, 1866, Part V, *ad finem*).

This was the third blow, which finally shattered my faith in the Anglican Church. . . . Such acts as were in progress led me to the gravest suspicion, not that it would soon cease to be a Church, but that it had never been a Church all along.

And then, after reproducing his correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject, he concludes:

As to the project of a Jerusalem Bishopric, I never heard of any good or harm it has ever done, except what it has done for me; which many think a great misfortune, and I one of the greatest of mercies. It brought me on to the beginning of the end.

By these words he invests with a sort of sacredness what is in itself only one of those many foolish acts by which the Church of England betrays from time to time its un-Catholic character.

The rest of the affair does not concern us directly but since we have begun the story we may as well finish it. Three "bishops" were sent out, to exercise jurisdiction over all Anglicans and Lutherans in Syria, Chaldea, Egypt and Abyssinia, a rather extensive and difficult contract. The first, appointed by England, was Michael Samuel Alexander (1842-45); then Prussia's turn came, and the Germans appointed Samuel Gobat von Cremines (1845-79); then England again had the selection and chose Joseph Barclay (1879-81). With him the entente ended, though the Anglicans, no longer contaminated by Lutheran Prussia, have, or had before the war, a Bishop "in" Jerusalem, whatever that means. This arrangement dates from 1887. He seems to have run pretty well with the Oriental Schismatics; and, by an odd chance, the school the Anglicans now have, was founded by the only one of the first group of three bishops that was a Prussian. It is rather confused all round, and those with a taste for Anglican controversy will find in this episode an excellent weapon. But for myself I am content to consider it solely as one of the providential means of giving to God's Church a convert whom some consider the greatest since the Reformation. Verily, *De Sion exhibit lex, et verbum Domini de Jerusalem*.

## Whence Come They?

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

A FAMOUS scientist once remarked in a vaunting mood that given matter and force he could construct the universe. The boast sounds like an echo of old Archimedes' vaunting offer that, given a lever and a fulcrum, he could move the earth. Each had little fear that his boast would be taken up. Possibly both the scientist and his Grecian predecessor thought that they could make good their brag; certainly the Greek set himself the far simpler task. But in either case, the instruments needed for the contemplated operations were admittedly beyond the power of the boasters; each felt his incapacity to furnish himself with the needed material and tools. The difference between them lies in the fact that Archimedes never expected anyone to furnish him with his gigantic toys, while the scientist could take his matter and force as actually existing and patent facts.

Matter and force and the directive Intelligence separate from them were the three factors which together brought the visible universe to its present state of development. The question arising immediately is whether that Intelligence, like the boastful scientist, was "given" matter and force to work with, just as the architect is given his bricks and steel and concrete and the power of his donkey engine. Are matter and force beings which exist by the force of their own nature and quite independently of any outside agency, or do they owe not merely their direction but their actual existence to the gigantic Intelligence which ordered them?

To answer this question we must apply to matter and force the two principles without which any scientific investigation would be as futile as questioning a parrot: Nothing begins to be without some cause capable of producing it; and, nothing exists without a sufficient reason to account for its existence. These are the principles which have enabled scientists, from a handful of flint arrows and a bit of broken pottery, to ascertain pretty exactly the intellectual development and culture of races that perished before the plans of the pyramids were drawn, and to plot out, from a knowledge of the Pennsylvania coalbeds, the vast, marshy forests that bloomed at a period when fish spawned on the peaks of the Rockies. A slight variation in the orbit of some planet is sufficient to show that some unknown and as yet unseen body is drawing it from its course. The presence of a characteristic unexplained by known elements led Madame Curie to the discovery of radium. Indeed the principles enunciated are the commonplaces of every scientific experiment. So if matter and force began at some time to exist, they must have had a cause sufficient to produce them; if they have been eternal, still they

must have some reason sufficient to explain their existence.

Our everyday experience has made us acquainted with the constant appearance of beings in the world that have their origin in others which in many cases are doomed to disappear. We meet everywhere the constantly recurring phenomena of plant life developing and propagating itself through seeds; we see on every side the mystery of birth and death and the passing on of life through generations that rise and fall like successive waves on a beach. Even the water of the seas and the rocks of the mountains were formed from the union of elements which in a prehistoric past bore but slight superficial resemblance to the forms they assumed in composition. We are, in fact, surrounded by links in a chain of causes and effects, which traces its beginnings to a period which no mathematician has as yet computed.

The mind is staggered at the idea that this chain of causes and effects has been in existence from eternity, that there really was no first cause. In fact, as was previously noted, such an hypothesis simply destroys the theory of evolution, for in an infinite duration matter and force should certainly have attained an infinite perfection, a thing which no sane man claims for them. Supposing then that they did exist eternally but only began to evolve themselves at a definite time in the past, we have an hypothesis which this time plays hob with the established law of inertia. For a body at rest by the force of its nature continues to stay in that state unless moved by some outside agency. A stone lying in the Grand Cañon will lie there until it is weathered into dust, unless some tourist pitches it into the rushing stream or some earthquake jars it from its resting place, or some other external force rudely moves it from its position. That is kindergarten science. So the idea of matter and force, which had been from eternity quiescent, suddenly springing into motion, indicates clearly that some other force must have been there to cause that first motion. In this case we have another indication of the influence of the directive Intelligence on the matter and force of the universe.

The extreme unlikelihood and even impossibility of an eternal series of causes and effects force us ultimately to a first cause which gave the rest existence or at least set in motion that long course of evolution. This first cause was itself either caused by some other cause, or it was the cause of itself, or it always existed and this by the force of its own nature. As it was the first cause, obviously it was not brought into existence by some other cause. The problem of a thing not yet in existence being the cause of itself makes the trick of lifting one's self by

the bootstraps seem the simplest athletic exercise. So if there was a first cause, which itself had no cause, it must have had an eternal existence due to its own inherent nature.

Such a being differs essentially from any other being in the range of experience. For every being we know from actual experience has the reason for its existence not in itself but in some other being. Conceive then a chain of causes and effects stretching back as far as you wish, even into eternity: corn producing grains and the grains fresh stalks; birds laying the eggs which are nurtured into small, gaping-mouthed fledglings. In each individual case the reason for the new being lay in the fact that a previous being had produced it, and since any one of a thousand or a million possible misfortunes, the dropping of the seed on a rock or the addling of the egg in the sun, could have prevented its coming into existence, each cause might easily have failed to act, and each effect was no more inevitable than are the pansies which the amateur gardener hopes to see sprouting from the seeds he trustfully planted. In fact, whole races of plants and animals, like the famous extinct race of trilobites, completely dropped out of existence, leaving behind no trace save bits of fossil embedded in the forming rock. And man himself for all his superlative gifts of mind and will finds traces of whole nations of beings like himself which some unknown disaster swept completely from the records of the past.

Not one single link in the chain but owes its forging to some outside agency; not one link but depends on a hundred doubtful circumstances; not one link which by the very force of its nature had to come into existence. We have in consequence a chain made up of links each one of which does not have the reason for its existence in itself but which depends on some other being; and it must be remembered that no chain is stronger than its weakest link. So if no single link is self-existing, the whole chain has the reason for its existence not in itself but in something outside of itself. And unless that being is self-existing and contains within its own nature the reason for its existence we have to continue our search until at last we come to a being that does exist by the force of its nature, and that owes the reason for its existence to itself alone. Make then the chain eternal if you wish; still each single link and hence the whole chain by their very nature demand some being which does not owe its existence to someone else but which exists because it is its nature to exist. And once more we are driven back to a first cause which differs essentially from all other beings in this universe and on which all other beings necessarily depend.

So matter and force not only owe their direction to something outside of themselves, but they depend upon this outside agency for their very existence. Now comes the question of how that outside agency, that directive Intelligence brought them into existence. Obviously, it did not find them ready to hand, for if it did, then they

are actually independent beings and in no way relying on the outside agency, the theory which our essay in armchair philosophy has been disproving. The directive Intelligence then must have produced them since they owe it their existence. This could have happened in either of two ways: either matter and force are parts of this self-existent Being, or they were called into existence, which they did not before possess. Certainly matter and force are not parts of the directive Intelligence, for that would drive us back once more to Pantheism with all its absurdities. So we are forced to admit that the Intelligence which directs the universe called matter and force into being, nothing but Itself previously existing. That is what we call the act of creation.

The unbelieving philosopher and essayist, whose sense of humor is often strikingly redundant, has had titillating fun laughing at the Christian God whom he loves to describe as a doddering old man seated on a glittering throne, surrounded by bored angels and saints, and occasionally breaking the monotony by wielding the lightning. Unfortunately that is humor without any point, for the essayist not only made the joke but the god as well. The Christian God is not a sort of super-minister in black coat and starched tie, with, possibly, a wobbly tiara. He is the infinite Intelligence which put order and plan into a world which without Him would be chaos. He is a being distinct from the world and hence enjoying a personal existence, an existence which He owes to none but Himself. We find Him exercising in the creative act a power which surpasses all powers we know anything about. It is not the man who adores such a God that is the fool. The fool is he who prefers no God, or a god of his own making, even if that god have clay feet, or wear the image of imperfect man.

## The Seal of Consecration

JOHN WILTBYE

**E**VEN in New York and on Chicago's West Side, there are a great many people, I suppose, hardworking citizens and suffragettes, sane in most respects, who occasionally wonder what a Catholic priest is, and if so, why? If submitted to a process of evaporation, they would probably crystallize their knowledge in the definition that a priest is an Irishman who buttons his celluloid collar in the back, and that he is so because he was crossed in love. Beyond this point, obviously inadequate, since some priests have been known to collar themselves with the choicest of Troy's fabrics, and others are undeniably English, or even undoubted descendants of one of the twelve tribes of Israel, their misinformation does not go. They are blood-brothers, many of them, to the Exeter Hall pamphleteer who strayed into the Birmingham Oratory while Father Gordon was lighting the candles for Benediction, and by sitting down to take notes, gave Newman an opportunity to endow him with immortality.

Another young priest came in with a long wand in his hand. . . . Another young priest: he thinks we were born priests; "priest" is a sort of race or animal, or production, as oxen or sheep may be, and there are young priests and old priests, and black priests and white priests, and perhaps men priests and women priests; and so in came this "other young priest" with a wand.

Still, I am not disposed to criticize these estimable citizens and suffragettes because of their large and interesting store of misinformation. Priests do not force themselves upon the multitude, proffering a thumb-nail biography. If there is a plague or a fire or an earthquake, you will find them about, intent upon their business; for the rest they keep much to themselves, devoting their time, as befits men of their high profession, to their round of duties. "The man in the street," then, is more to be pitied than blamed for his misinformation, but he is to be blamed and not pitied at all, when he insists that his knowledge of priests, and how they became so, is identical with the ultimate truth.

Now the "celluloid collar and Celtic theory" is disproved by a glance at the "Catholic Directory," and a casual inspection of the next dozen priests one chances to meet. I saw three today, and I am sure all have a laundry bill. The "crossed in love" hypothesis, not subject, it is true, to the test of visual inspection, can be sustained by any number of sugar-and-water romances, but I search in vain the archives of my own experience and that of others, for any confirmation based on fact. It is about as true as the idea made popular by our brilliant American stage, that nuns employ most of their time in playing with cats, birds, and similar small deer, and, when astronomical conditions warrant, turn tear-dimmed eyes to the summer moon, maudering on the dear dead days beyond recall, the while they recite verses of the well-known "The hours I spent with thee, dear heart" variety. A world which accepts this sort of nun should regard with gratitude, and not with bitterness, the abbess of fiction, who was wont to immure those of her community whose conduct evinced such unconventional tendencies. From what I know of monasteries, convents and the priesthood, I have a well-grounded suspicion that the requirements of these several states of life would prove anything but soothing to a broken heart. Charming indeed is it, to individuals of a sentimental tendency, to clothe themselves in the flowing robes of religion, insisting always upon a habit of a becoming cut, and then, through an atmosphere of incense and many creature-comforts, to glide calmly and sweetly into the hollow tomb, as Mr. Micawber would say (or is it Mr. Toots?), followed by the plaudits of the good and great, and, especially, by the wild sobs of the "heart-breaker," the cause of this singular vocation. But it is quite another thing to get out of bed of a winter's morning, at an hour when even self-respecting chickens are still a-roost; it is not in any sense inspiring to spend one's God-given talents in correcting little Cissy O'Brien's firm persuasion that seven times six is thirty-five; and it is not at all like the religious odor of incense to try to induce some bottle-scarred veteran of your parish to give up the drink for the sake of the children. Next to the Church the consecrated life is the most real thing in the world. It has no root in puppy love, and no use for the soul that shrouds itself in a mist of sentimentality, which the romancers attribute to a broken heart, but which in reality is only a form of barren selfishness.

But if this sort of blighted affection never leads to the sanctuary, I can readily conceive that there are high-souled men and women who have known the best that pure human affection can give, and have rejected it, because of a call to the higher life. There is nothing of self, no trace of weak "sentiment" in giving up the dearest thing in life, and sacrifice is the rock upon which such vocations are founded. The soul knows the sweetness of human love, yet relinquishes it, to give itself completely to the most excellent love of Jesus Christ. Readers of Henry Harland will recall how this theme is developed most charmingly, and with an insight vouchsafed only to a Catholic, in "My Friend Prospero." Winthorpe, a Unitarian, cultured, of an old family, and secure in worldly fortune, becomes a Catholic, and shortly thereafter discovers a vocation to the priesthood. His betrothed, "who should have scratched his

eyes out," gives instead, her approval, and employs herself in "scrubbing the floors of an Ursuline convent as a novice." "And there are two lives spoiled" says the cynical world in the person of Prospero:

Oh, no, no, contended Maria Dolores, earnestly. Not spoiled. On the contrary. It is sad, in a way, if you like, but it is very beautiful, it is heroic. Their love must have been a very beautiful love, that could lead them to such self-sacrifice. Two lives given to God. . . . What you call an inhuman story, seems to me a wonderfully noble one.

In his recent play, "Unmade in Heaven" (Dodd, Mead), Mr. Bradford treats the same theme, although he is not so inhuman as to adopt the counsel of Hamlet, and send the lady into a nunnery. Hardinge, a believer in nothing in particular, is engaged to a devout Catholic girl, Eleanor Wade. Falling under the influence of a certain "Father White," he becomes a Catholic, a fact which prepares the wedding bells to ring out their glad message to the April skies. But the music dies in their throats, as Hardinge announces his intention of becoming a priest, and, although feeling that she shall never again know happiness, Eleanor gives her consent. The sacrifice that tears the heart-strings of both, is treated with reverence and delicacy, and the play closes with a scene which draws its rare dramatic power from the fact that it springs from truth. Their marriage, the union of two finely wrought souls, with all that it meant to each, has been "Unmade in Heaven."

I cannot accept Mr. Bradford's "Father Nelson," and I fear that the grounds of conversion advanced by the heroine's mother and finally reached by Hardinge are the basis of a pseudo-mysticism, rather than of Catholicism. Furthermore, I do not escape the feeling that in Mr. Bradford's scheme of things, vocation to the priesthood necessarily follows a keen and ardent realization of the supernatural. The primal vocation of every Christian is to advance towards union with God through charity. He finds the means best suited to attain that end, in the state of life to which he is called by Almighty God. That state is not necessarily sacerdotal. The Roman martyrology enshrines the name of more than one comedian, and from that sacred record, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker are not excluded. Nor does personal sanctity, a living, ever-widening realization of the worth of the things of God, necessarily lead that happy soul into the sanctuary, as the beautiful life of Francis of Assisi, and thousands of holy persons in every state of life, bears ample witness.

No doubt, the theologian and the ascetic can detect other shortcomings in this fine play, but we have to thank Mr. Bradford for a sympathy with things Catholic, as grateful as it is unusual. His great merit is that he sees clearly the dominant Catholic idea that there can be no Christianity without the Cross. "The world of today needs just such examples of really giving up something, really giving up everything—for God only, for God always, and all in all." He that loseth his life shall find it. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was no dreamy mystic, but the God-Man who took upon Himself the burdens of suffering humanity, freely, gladly. His love of the sinner. His tenderness with little children, His tears at the grave of His friend Lazarus, have invested Him in the eyes of the world, with a halo of surpassing human beauty. But the message of His life was sacrifice. He had joy set before Him, but He chose the Cross. These things He did for our salvation, our solace in tribulation, and for an example. If it is sweet to love, it is sweeter to suffer for those we love, and in the Catholic ideal, it is Jesus, God at once and our brother in the flesh through His Incarnation, who is the first beloved. Not thwarted ambition, not broken hopes, form the priest of God, but that free choice of the cause of Christ, offered to those whom He calls, and made possible by a practical realization of the first and greatest commandment.

## COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters, as a rule, should be limited to six-hundred words.*

## A Spiritual Ambassador

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of December 1 a most interesting article, with the title "A Spiritual Ambassador," contains an extract from the Rt. Rev. Lord Abbot of Caldey, which is in part as follows:

These are called late vocations. . . . At the present time, so far as we know, there is in the British Isles no place where men can be received [into a seminary or the novitiate of a religious house until they have been tested and prepared, and have acquired a knowledge of Latin], nor is there any machinery for dealing with them.

The present writer began *mensa* with many other men at Mount Melleray Seminary, where the Cistercian Fathers have been educating students for the missions for more than *seventy* years. Scores of men would never have reached the altar but for them, who, thanks to the Melleray Monks, are now good priests in the United States, Canada, Newfoundland, England, Scotland, Australia and elsewhere.

St. Johns, Newfoundland.

P. P.

## Catholic Chaplains

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The transatlantic mails work rather slowly. I have only received within the last few days the issues of AMERICA of November 3 and November 10. This will explain why it is a month after date that I send you information to correct a statement made in an article in the issue for November 3, in which it is stated by Mr. Charles Dawson that "the *English troops in Salonika and Mesopotamia are wholly without priests.*" If this were true it would be a sad reflection on the zeal of our priests in Great Britain and Ireland, and on the organizing intelligence of the Catholic Hierarchy and the British War Office. Happily the statement is not correct.

I knew it was not correct when I read it, because I have friends acting as chaplains out East, but before replying I communicated with Archbishop's House, Westminster, and I have the following reply from the department that, in concert with the War Office, has been arranging for the supply of Catholic chaplains:

There have been Catholic chaplains in both Mesopotamia and Salonika from the very beginning of the campaign. At the present moment there are in Mesopotamia fifty Catholic chaplains, the full strength of the War Office establishment there. In Salonika there are about forty now.

Owing to transferences in the Mediterranean it is difficult to say at any given moment how many chaplains there are in an area, but the above for Salonika is substantially correct.

Catholics have been treated with a generous liberality by the British Government in this matter of the provision of chaplains. As for Mesopotamia, there was even a chaplain at the advanced post at Kut-el-Amara when it was besieged. He came from India with the first troops that landed in the Persian Gulf. Every expeditionary force has been accompanied by Catholic chaplains on all the fronts, and chaplains are also provided for the training camps at home. I am sure you will be glad to correct the misleading statement made in Mr. Dawson's article, with the help of this information.

Isleworth, England.

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have been tempted to write to you after reading Father Davitt's letter, deploring the lack of chaplains in Camp Mac-

Arthur, Texas, which appeared in your issue of December 15. Great as is the need of additional Catholic chaplains at that camp, I believe there is a still greater need here in Camp McClellan. We have here about 30,000 federalized National Guardsmen, who hail from Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia and the District of Columbia and form the Twenty-ninth Division. Of these, it is claimed by Y. M. C. A. workers, that 1,500 are Hebrews, and that there are at least as many more who profess or practise no religion whatsoever. Of the remainder, it is estimated after careful examination, that at least 13,500 are Catholics. There are fourteen non-Catholic chaplains, all in the service of the Government, to minister to the spiritual needs of non-Catholics, but there is not a single regularly appointed Catholic chaplain to look after the welfare of the men of the Catholic Faith. The only priests in Camp McClellan are the Rev. Charles O'Gallagher and the writer of this letter, both laboring under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus.

It is inspiring to witness the faith and devotion of the men, and it is heartrending to see so many kept away from the Sacraments through lack of sufficient priests to hear confessions. Four Masses are celebrated in the camp on Sundays, the last being celebrated in the open air, weather permitting. This open-air Mass is not a matter of choice but of necessity, since the K. of C. building can accommodate only about one-third of the congregation usually present at this service. On Sunday, December 16, Bishop Allen of Mobile administered the Sacrament of Confirmation to a class of fifty-five soldiers, fourteen of whom had but recently sought admission to the Church; twenty-five others had just received First Communion. Doubtless other earnest seekers after truth, and there are many such here, would become members of the Church, if opportunities were offered of coming in contact with Catholic priests. Perhaps the most saddening feature of the whole situation is that there are numerous "stray sheep" who could be led back to the fold if there were only enough shepherds to go in search of them. Unfortunately these same men, brave, noble and self-sacrificing, may soon be called upon to cross the seas and to offer the supreme sacrifice, without having had an opportunity of making their peace with God.

Anniston, Ala.

MICHAEL J. CORR,  
K. of C. Chaplain.

## Some Irish, Old and New

To the Editor of AMERICA:

An old Holy Cross College boy, of the class of '61, begs your indulgence and asks for a little space in your paper to add a humble contribution to the discussion of the above-named subject. For years the Americans of Irish descent have been obliged to listen to ignorant sneers and vulgar slurs hurled at them by the "ould country Irish"; I recall a few of them, namely, "country-born," "second crop" and "Yankee-born." Our girls were contemptuously referred to as "narrow-backs" and other disparaging terms were applied to them which I am unable to remember at the present time. Internal discord has wrought great havoc on the Irish nation; years of grinding poverty put servility into the very marrow of some people, but the history of the United States proves to my mind that Irishmen, when leaving Ireland, brought more virtue than vices to their adopted land, and my reply to such types of Irish who sneer at the sons of the "old stock" is that no logic can pierce the armor-plate of ignorance. Clannishness breeds ignorance; a Catholic education is the only cure to instruct the minds of those who are steeped in provincial illiteracy. Let us hope that this excellent prescription will be widely used.

Boston.

PHILIP J. LIBBY.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I trust you will allow an interested reader to express his hope that the old Irish courtesy and broadmindedness may prevail in the discussion which seems to have been opened by yourself and Thomas F. Woodlock under the title "Some Irish, Old and New."

Suppose I were to suggest that in Ireland the people are and were demoralized by the real original John Bull, whereas here we seem in many cases to cower before a second-rate imitation or understudy John Bull, would that be a violation of the counsel of perfection with which I have begun? The average, everyday American is anything but an understudy of the transatlantic cousin, as the course of the war will demonstrate; still it cannot be denied that there is a noisy and perhaps influential group in this country who think London is the place for real folk to live, when the war in the air is over.

One notices persons with Irish names who have learned, maybe in Harvard, maybe in "society," to echo the anti-Irish blunders of the Anglomaniacs. These "society" Irish probably voted for Mitchel in New York, and pooh-poohed the AMERICA and Extension protests against Mexican outrages. They take good care to keep mum about the Pope's peace proposals, and they are painfully shocked by the manly protests of AMERICA and of Cardinal Bourne against the vulgar and malignant misrepresentations of those proposals in the jingo press of London; or rather, they took their cue from the Anglomaniacs, and pretended to be shocked.

Your Anglomaniac and his imitator with an Irish name have as little use for English democrats as they have for manly men in Ireland. And when Mitchel and his supporters opened their chivalrous campaign against the New York Sisterhoods, there was quite a list of Irish names among the holier-than-thou devotees who were edified by their chivalry. Other persons with Irish names, who cannot boast of the enlightenment of Harvard or Yale, or of the fine social polish of the "four hundred," but who happen to know a little Irish history, will recall the folk O'Connell apologized for emancipating and their predecessors and successors in the Old Land. In modern Ireland the revival of the old language has given back to the people an expressive label for this whole class of ultra-respectable persons in Ireland and in America who are ashamed of their ancestry; they are bluntly named "shoneens," which merely means that they are what they strive to be, second-hand, if somewhat misunderstood, imitations of what they imagine the English aristocracy to be.

It is not of much importance whether there be a greater proportion of this class of people in Ireland, where English policy is willing and able to produce it, than in America, where no really powerful agencies work for the same end. In America, indeed, the very spirit and genius of the country acts for the most part in the opposite direction, and tends to create self-respect, self-reliance, and the highest type of manly character. At all events, that is what the manlier men of Ireland have always thought about America. It is also a merely academic question whether the shoneen in Ireland or the shoneen in America be the less excusable for being what he is. The practical question is twofold: First, we must make it our business that his tribe does not increase; and second, we must not allow him to pose as the authentic representative of our race in Ireland or in America. If we, like other races, must know our history and use it, let it warn us against the peril of false brethren at all events, so that we may insist that as they have gone out from us, they stay out where they belong. Like the outgoing Mayor of New York, they are a liability and not an asset to any side they join.

In this day of world democracy we can ill afford to have our race and our religion identified with admirers and imi-

tators of aristocracy, whether genuine or *brummagem*, whether in England or in America. We owe it to ourselves, to our race and creed, and also to America, to be identified with the democratic ideal which the war will realize in Germany and also in England. Genuine friendship with England requires that all Americans be heart and soul with the democrats of England and not with the feudal oligarchy which those democrats want to abolish. And such sympathy would be one of the best safeguards against the shoneenism that weakens and disgraces our race and our creed, in Ireland as well as in America.

San Francisco.

L. O. ALLEN.

### The Geographical Magazine's Hagiology

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The *National Geographical Magazine* for October, in a description of the flags of the British Empire, confesses it is at a loss to account for certain facts concerning the flag, and unconsciously the writer of the description confesses a very rudimentary knowledge of British history. The English flag has a Greek cross on it called the cross of St. George, a white saltier called the cross of St. Andrew, and a red saltier known as the cross of St. Patrick. These two decussate crosses were added to the English flag in 1801 after the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland, possibly to indicate by heraldry the "double crossing" of the Irish by Castlereagh.

Among the many facts that the writer does not know is how St. Andrew became patron of Scotland. The article tells us St. Andrew was martyred in the year 69 A. D. at Papras. He was not. He was martyred November 30, in the year 60, by the Roman governor Æglas at Patræ in Achaia. The tradition is that the cross used was an X cross, *crux decussata* (*decussis*, the symbol for the number ten). Cainnech, a disciple of St. Colum-Cille, founded a church of St. Andrew at Kilrimont across the Firth of Forth from Edinburgh, and as early as 908 Cellach (Kelly), Bishop of this St. Andrew's, was primate of Scotland. The patron of the primatial see naturally became the patron of the kingdom.

The writer says: "The use of St. Patrick's cross is in defiance of all ecclesiastical usage and custom because St. Patrick never suffered martyrdom. . . . It is said that he was never canonized, but that his sainthood, like his cross, is due to popular error." He tells us St. Patrick was born in Scotland near where Glasgow now stands about the middle of the fifth century and lived ninety years; that he found Ireland a land of barbarism and left it a seat of learning and piety. He was born at Kilpatrick near Dumbarton toward the end of the fourth century and he died March 17, 493, at the age of 106 years.

The Catholic doctrine of veneration of the saints is as old as the Church, and from the very beginning the cultus of the martyrs was formal. Bishops or primates officially declared that a given person was really a martyr for the Faith, a saint, and this episcopal sanction was necessary for the restricted territory under the jurisdiction of the bishop. Formal recognition by the Bishop of Rome was necessary to make a martyr's cultus universal. Bishops canonically punished those who venerated martyrs before the formal recognition.

In the fourth century this technical recognition of confessors was in operation, but some authorities, Bellarmine for instance, think it is uncertain when confessors became the objects of Christian veneration. Bellarmine says we do not find confessors spoken of as such before the year 800, when the feasts of Sts. Martin and Remigius are mentioned in the catalogue of saints drawn up by the Council of Mainz. The reason St. Patrick was not formally canonized, in the modern sense of the term, is that he lived too early in the history of the Church. His so-called cross is not a popular error, but a very modern invention and not popular at all.

The saying that his sainthood is a popular error was probably not meant to be taken in its crude apparent foolishness. It seems to be an example of obscure rhetoric trying to express the notion that St. Patrick was never formally canonized. He is classed as a martyr in very early martyrologies because of the numerous attempts at assassination made against him during his apostolate in Ireland. In one of these attempts a javelin hurled at him killed the charioteer standing beside him. All authorities agree that Patrick was one of the greatest saints in the whole history of the Christian Church. His work for good has had a wider extension than that of any apostle since the first century, because the christianization of Europe from the Hebrides to Milan and southeast to Bulgaria was the work of Irishmen, the spiritual children of St. Patrick. Zimmer's essay on the "Irish Element in Medieval Culture" gives a scientific and disinterested account of this work.

The writer in the *Geographical Magazine* says that St. Patrick found Ireland "A land of barbarism and left it a seat of learning and piety." This is a half-truth. He left it a seat of learning and piety, but it is surprising the editor of the magazine should be so wanting in scholarship as to let pass the statement that Ireland at the advent of St. Patrick was barbarous. If space permitted it would be a mere mechanical task to show the unpardonable lack of historical knowledge in this remark, but the Irish epic the "*Tain Bo Chnailgne*," which was in existence about three centuries before Christ, would alone overset this irritating nonsense. The only epic of growth in all human literature that approaches in excellence the *Tain* is the *Iliad*, which is largely a Greek version of the Celtic sagas in the *Tain*. These were left to Homer by the Grecian Celts.

When the Germanic barbarians were destroying the civilization of Europe in St. Patrick's time the single oasis of learning in northern Europe was Ireland, and it remained the chief repository of learning for all northern and middle Europe until those other Germanic barbarians, the Norsemen and Danes, ravaged it. See books like Hyde's "Literary History of Ireland" and the remainder of the library. Long before St. Patrick's time the Irish "barbarians" invented rhyme as it is now used in all the literatures of the world. The first European love songs were Irish, as was the first European dictionary. From the fifth to the seventh century the Irish preserved literature for Europe. Ferghal, the Irish Bishop of Salsburg, in 745 proved the rotundity of the earth. As Green says, from the sixth to the eighth century the Irish influence on Christianity was such that "For a time it seemed as if . . . Celtic and not Latin Christianity was to mold the destinies of the churches of the West." Ireland had the first federal government after Rome, and it had it long before St. Patrick's time. All the monasteries of middle and northern Europe in the early Middle Ages were taught music, mathematics and Greek by Irishmen, and all modern triple-phrase music is Irish in origin. The Irish never persecuted any race on the face of the earth, but they have carried the peace of Christ to the four quarters of the world. We never were barbarians and we are not such now. The last grace of genuine comedy is necessary to any great literature and every genuine comedy in the English language was written by an Irishman except those Congreve made, and he was educated in Ireland. Shakespeare's comedies are no comedies in the proper sense of the term. The Irishman Kelvin made modern navigation possible, as the Irishman Fulton made the steamboat, and the Fenian Holland made the submarine, and the half-Irishman Marconi made the wireless telegraph. The two great orators in English were Burke and O'Connell. And our soldiers, God bless them! have reddened every fair field of the world with the blood of gentlemen; and, by the Rock of Cashel, they always fought like gentlemen, never like barbarians.

Philadelphia.

AUSTIN O'MALLEY.

#### St. Vincent de Paul Society

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In a recent issue of AMERICA L. E. enumerates some shortcomings of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, practically admitting, since he endeavors to defend or at least excuse it, the failure of the society to provide adequate relief, to keep records and to cooperate with other relief agencies. This criticism, as well as L. E.'s admission is unjust because he cannot be in a position to know whether these conditions, existing in one or two Conferences, are verified in all. His letter sins in that he universalizes the deficiencies of one Conference. Unfortunately scarcely two Conferences seem to follow identical methods, a state of affairs which is due to the fact that each is conducted along lines which happen to suit its spiritual director. Methods of relief are as numerous as pastors.

For a number of years I have been a member of a Conference which provides adequate relief, keeps records and cooperates with others laboring in the same field. Many people have a false idea of the meaning of adequate relief. It does not mean permanent assistance. Relief is essentially temporary, i.e., during need, and no charitable organization is or can be expected to provide a constant source of subsistence for anyone. Every case is provided for adequately, if present needs are met and assistance discontinued when the needy are in a position to help themselves. Relief is not merely help; it has a purpose, namely, to tide over the poor until they can help themselves.

As for records, they are absolutely necessary for systematic and intelligent relief work. They are tabooed in many Conferences because they reflect too much of modern philanthropy; card-indexing particularly is held in holy horror. However, because this method has been subject to abuse we need not condemn it. St. Vincent de Paul himself did not disdain to keep records. "The poor should not be labeled and catalogued; their personal affairs should be sacred." So be it. In our parish a census was taken last fall; the good pastor asked more intimate questions about myself and family than would ever be necessary in any application for relief. Nevertheless my answers were checked off on a card; now I am probably labeled and catalogued but I presume it is all "sacred" as well. Up-to-date business methods do not imply the sacrifice of any rule or principle of the society; for intelligent work they are absolutely necessary and should be adopted.

The third criticism is lack of cooperation with other agencies. From the spiritual standpoint there is of course no comparison. The field is exclusively that of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, though other societies encourage affiliation with a church. From an economic point of view we can obtain as good, if not better, results, provided we see every case to a solution. In this many other agencies fail; aiming primarily at statistics, they close some cases with the statement that they have been referred to "So and So." In other words, instead of solving the difficulty it is shifted elsewhere. We, however, can keep at it until the difficulty no longer exists by using the same means as they do, but not closing the case thereat. Instead of cooperating we should anticipate. Cooperation does not mean the disclosure of private information obtained through the channels of the society to an investigator. Here, too, we have an advantage; because the information we obtain is known to be sacred, we can the more easily learn the truth.

In order to attain success in a St. Vincent de Paul sense we need a much more intelligent use of the means of ameliorating living conditions. The necessity of relief in every instance is due to some individual, either economically misplaced or personally delinquent; and for every case there is a solution. We need not therefore await the arrival of the trained charity worker. We know what "her" procedure will be; we should do it ourselves.

New York.

R. S.

# A M E R I C A

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;  
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00  
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

### Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

*Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.*

### The Epiphany

THE recently published code of canon law, which is to become operative next Pentecost, makes the Epiphany a holiday of obligation throughout the world; and once the new legislation has gone into effect, all Catholics, no matter what their race or habitat, will be obliged under pain of sin, unless excused by a grave reason, to render to God on the sixth of January the supreme act of Divine worship which consists in participation in the Sacrifice of the Mass. With the restoration of the feast to its ancient place as one of the principal solemnities of the ecclesiastical year, it is to be hoped that the Faithful will be directed to pierce through the poetry with which the accretions of centuries have surrounded the day, and to get at the heart of the feast.

The interesting geographical and astrological questions connected with the mysterious Wise Men of the East, the mystical significance of the gifts brought by the Kings from afar to lay at the feet of the Infant Christ, the futility of the efforts of King Herod, who symbolizes mankind in general, to frustrate Divine plans, while pious and helpful and natural considerations, have absorbed too much attention and have tended to obscure the essential character of the Epiphany. These are only the royal trappings of the feast, they are secondary at best, and it would be a mistake to fix our attention on them rather than on God. The solemnity of the Epiphany has for its main liturgical function to bring out into strong relief the manifestation of Christ's Divine Kingship, and his right to the service of all mankind.

Christ, in spite of apparent weakness, is King of all men, of saints, of angels, of shepherds, of kings. All flesh is but as grass before Him. He is no respecter of persons. It is He who created the most regal offerings we can make Him; the best we can do is but a poor token of service and homage. Our gifts are not ours

but His, it is condescension pure and simple on His part to deign to receive them. Potentates of this earth have no power but what He gives them; to set their might against His is to parade their little strength for a little day, and in the end to dash themselves to ruin against the rock of His omnipotence.

The meaning of the Epiphany is simply this: Christ is absolute Lord and Master, and men, whether great or small, are merely vassals, serving in different functions in His court; the duty of all men on the feast itself and throughout the cycle of the feast is to do Him homage, to proclaim His sovereignty, and to renew their fealty as liege subjects in the Kingdom which He has set up here in time, but which is destined to endure throughout the ages of eternity.

### Three Christmas Messages

IT is interesting to contrast the messages written by the Holy Father, and by the Cardinals, the Archbishops of Baltimore and New York. In common they are replete with the peace to men of good-will, of which the Angels sang as the shepherds crossed the hills to Bethlehem. Cardinal Farley's words, first printed in AMERICA, exhort us to perfect confidence, particularly in times of the most trying need, in God who does all things sweetly, while in the birth of Our Saviour, the venerable prelate of Baltimore finds an exemplification, such as only God could conceive, of the beauty and necessity of obedience.

It does not seem fanciful to trace in the messages the spirit which has made these two great Cardinals pillars of strength to Church and State. "The obedient man," says Holy Writ, "shall speak of victory," and even the most determined opponent of the Church must reckon with the victories over prejudice and error achieved by Cardinal Gibbons, during a long career in which, with singular persuasiveness, he has presented to a reluctant world the claims of all legitimate authority. Similarly, nothing has been more characteristic of the Metropolitan of New York, whose spirited labors have caused this portion of the field of Christ to be enriched with an abundant and lasting fruitage, than an unwavering trust in Almighty God, childlike in its tenderness and in the reward which it merits.

Turning to the letter of Benedict XV, it is indeed touching to know that in the midst of many and heartsearching cares, the Holy Father has not forgotten his children in America. Surely God's blessing will rest upon our nation if, following His behest, we recognize in the Babe of Bethlehem the great sign of God's love for fallen man, and strive to learn at the Crib, "the lesson of unflinching courage and self-sacrifice." The Father of Christendom as he is, the heart of Benedict XV turns with the simplicity of greatness "to the little children to whom this day belongs," and he implores them, whose voices the Child Christ will gladly hear, since they recall in some manner the lisping words of Nazareth

To pray with all their hearts to the Babe of Bethlehem that He may protect their loved ones, and give back to the world that peace which He came to bring upon earth.

May the words of our great American prelates hearten us to new energy in the task which now engages us, while the prayers of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, linked with the supplication and tears of earth's innocent ones, bring us nearer to the day desired of all, in which lasting peace shall spring forth from righteous victory.

#### A Federal Decision and the Mass

MANY were the friends of prohibition who had no doubt whatever that the prohibition law of Oklahoma could not possibly cause any inconvenience in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. No court, they said, would uphold a contrary opinion, and statements of this optimistic tenor were obtained from "prominent lawyers." The sincerity of these advocates of prohibition need not be questioned, but it is greatly to be regretted that their attitude was shared by many Catholics, most of whom probably labored under the delusion that "the Federal Constitution protects every citizen in the free exercise of his religion." How vain were these assurances is now apparent from a decision rendered on December 24 by United States District Judge Clark, sitting at Oklahoma City. The law of Oklahoma prohibits the importation of alcoholic liquors into the State. Judge Clark has now affirmed the validity of that law in as far as it forbids railroads and other common carriers to bring wine into the State, "*even for sacramental purposes.*"

Appeal will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States in due form. While it is rash to forecast the possible action of that august tribunal, the grounds on which the Supreme Court can reverse Judge Clark's ruling are certainly not obvious. If a State indirectly forbids the use of wine in the Holy Sacrifice by prohibiting the manufacture, importation or possession of wine, for any purpose whatsoever, no clause of the Federal Constitution can be invoked in restraint. It is high time that Catholics should realize this fact. Oklahoma has made her law. Until such time as an enlightened public opinion obtains the repeal of those sections which can possibly affect the Holy Sacrifice, Oklahoma not only may, but must, abide by the legislation which she has created. Furthermore, abstracting wholly from any Federal question, in a conflict between the law of the Church, requiring genuine wine for the Holy Sacrifice, and a civil law prohibiting the use of wine for any purpose whatsoever, every court is bound to uphold the precedence of the civil law. For the canon law has no binding force upon American courts, which accept it, not as *law*, but as *fact*. When will Catholics learn the lesson of "resisting the beginnings"? As has been pointed out more than once in these pages, safety can be guaranteed only by securing the insertion into State prohibition measures, *before* their approval by the respective legislatures, and into proposed State constitutional amendments, of a clause which either

specifically authorizes the use of wine for sacramental purposes, or limits the prohibition to alcoholic liquors "for beverage purposes." Otherwise, we shall face long and tedious processes of litigation, and must meet consequences of the gravest character, in case an absolute "bone-dry" legislation is upheld by the courts.

#### Breaking into a Convent

IT is not strange, but very natural, that the world should regard all who would live godly in Christ Jesus as fools, for it was in Herod that the world clothed the wisdom of God in robes of mockery, and Herod still lives. His closest followers cannot look for gentler treatment. They cannot hope that the world will even try to understand their motives, or justly rate their work. But out of the evil that the world plots God draws good. Some weeks ago the New York press chronicled the story of how a woman had made application for the custody of her daughter, a teaching Sister, on the ground that the Sister was either insane, or detained by force in her convent. Apparently, she could see no other reason why such institutions as convents could exist. With customary inaccuracy, the newspapers gave no hint that the mother was not a Catholic; but a Socialist. A full legal inquiry followed. The Sister is still in her convent, and bigotry has rarely met with a rebuke so keen as was administered by Judge Faber:

If love of religion is insanity, the world would be better if we were all insane. Daily on the blood-stained battlefields of Europe, those who are fighting the fight for the emancipation of the world, and who are maimed in the terrible slaughter, find solace and comfort in their sufferings, at the gentle hands of those pious ladies who wear the garb that this young woman wears. To aspire to the religious life is not mania. It is a noble ambition.

This notable example of "Romish persecution" is too valuable to be left under a bushel by controversialists whose last interest is for the truth. Doubtless the New York Sister will soon assume a place in the gallery of "convent horrors."

Catholics often wish that their assailants were more ardent disciples of the truth, and they would be, very probably, if they could arrive at some possession of a sense of humor. An English convert used to relate with amusement her first visit to a convent. She had come, not for spiritual solace, but in fear and trembling, and only because she had heard that the nuns could teach her the Roman pronunciation of Latin. Before passing through the fatal doors, she instructed her coachman to call for her in fifteen minutes. If the call were not answered within five minutes, he was to inform the police without delay that a kidnapping had occurred. Not the public authorities, but a little common-sense, came to her rescue. Searching for some possible quality in herself which might induce the Sisters to steal her, she could find none.

Despite the contrary assertion, occasionally repeated

even in this day and country, few Mother Superioresses are in the habit of forcing casual visitors to become nuns, invoking, for the benefit of reluctant damosels and dowagers, the aid of chains and dungeons. Long ago it was discovered in conventual establishments, that such means rarely lead to any true or lasting love of the religious life and its practices. There is really no reason why anyone should wish to "break into a convent." It is incomparably more convenient and far less likely to attract the attention of the police to go to the front door and ring the bell. "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage." It is easy to get into a convent, and easier to get out. But the only power that will keep anyone there is a brave and happy spirit which counts the things of this world as nothing, in comparison with the love given in abundance to those who leave all to follow Christ.

#### "The Honest Catholic"

**T**HE Archbishop of St. Louis, whose monthly sermons have for some years been a source of strength and enlightenment to citizens of all creeds in the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, has recently drawn an excellent portrait of the "honest Catholic." In the mind of the Archbishop the title is equivalent to a patent of nobility, and the duties which it implies and exacts are not few. He is not an honest Catholic whose religion is confined to the observation of the Seventh Commandment, or who capitalizes his Faith for commercial purposes, or who subordinates it to his social ambitions, or who prides himself on his intimacy with non-Catholics, and then comes back "to the Catholic body to tell us what we should do." Nor are they honest Catholics "who do not love the Faith, live the Faith, fight for the Faith."

The honest Catholic, on the other hand, is the man who, recognizing his subjection to Almighty God, orders his life according to his belief. To the Church, the mystical Body of Jesus Christ, he gives that unswerving loyalty which is at once her due, and his own greatest glory. He warmly advocates the founding of parochial schools, and invariably chooses them for his children "that they may become honest Catholics, and ever retain both their honesty and their Catholicism." He knows that social happiness depends upon a mutual acknowledgment of rights; he is careful, therefore, not to entrench upon the rights of his neighbor, but he insists that his own rights be respected by all. He does not make patriotism a cloak for self-seeking, but considers it "the energy of service and love taught him by his Faith."

Thus depicted, this honest Catholic may be adjudged a person of stern, even of belligerent temperament, at whose appearance the amenities of social life must suffer. Yet truth must come first, and "it is always better," replies the Archbishop, "to be right than merely agreeable." An agreeable manner is a gift of God, valu-

able in its place, but an instrument for evil, if it induces its possessor to a compromise or sacrifice of principle. We cannot serve God, if we would always please men. One need seek no further than the third chapter of Genesis to learn that the floodgates of the world's woe were opened, when, to please a creature, our first father violated God's command.

#### The Bethlehemites

**D**URING this sacred season Bethlehem has not been the least among the cities of Juda. The little town and its little King have been the center of the world's thoughts. Even those who do not worship as God the Child who was born in the City of David, 2,000 years ago, have reverently turned their eyes to the Crib where the Child was placed by His Virgin Mother and where the Wise Men of the East came to adore Him.

There is a Divine and irresistible attraction in the memories of the birth-place of the Man-God. There, in visible form, He began to show His love for fallen man. There appeared the benignity, the grace, the loving kindness, the humanity of the Saviour. The Crib is but His first step to the Cross. And no one can learn the stern lessons of Calvary and its Victim without passing through the lowly portals of the cave which sheltered the Child. It may interest American Catholics to learn that here in the New World a religious body of men, affiliated to the great order of St. Francis of Assisi, once bore the name of "Bethlehemites" in honor of the heavenly Babe, whom its members promised to serve in helping the sick and the outcast. The records of the congregation prove the undying charity of the Church for suffering humanity. They furnish also an eloquent refutation of the charge that the Catholic Church took but little interest in the welfare of the Indian tribes conquered by the Spaniards four centuries ago.

The founder of the Bethlehemites was Pedro de Betancourt, a Spanish nobleman, a descendant of that Juan de Betancourt who conquered the Canary Islands for the Kings of Spain. Saddened, while working in the city of Guatemala, by the wretched condition of its sick poor, he built a rude hut as a hospital and on his own shoulders frequently carried to this improvised shelter the victims of the plague and the wreckage of humanity which chance threw in his way or which his own tender charity made him salvage in the byways of the town. The work grew. Popes and kings approved and helped it and viceroys and peons gave it their alms. Exhausted by his labors, Pedro de Betancourt, still in the vigor of manhood, died in 1667.

The name of the "Bethlehemite Brethren" was a familiar and a loved one in Latin America. To the vows of poverty, chastity and hospitality, they added another vow, that of caring at the risk of their lives, if need be, for the sick, even those infected with contagious diseases. To every hospital, a school for poor children

was added, a refutation of the oft-repeated accusation that Catholic Spain neglected the education of the natives of her colonies. The "Bethlehemite" hospitals were built on a splendid scale, in the solid and spacious architecture of the Spanish colonies, with airy halls and wide patios made bright with fountains and waving palms. Visitors to Havana may have seen one of the specimens of these splendid mansions for the poor and the sick in the Colegio de Belén, or Bethlehem, which passed from the hands of the Bethlehemites, on their suppression, into the hands of the Spanish Government, and was later transferred by Queen Isabella in the middle of the last century to the Society of Jesus. A chain of Bethlehemite hospitals linked Havana and Guatemala through the City of Mexico, Lima, Arequipa,

Santiago de Chile and Buenos Ayres with the southernmost limits of the New World. Over thirty of their hospitals offered shelter to the sick and the homeless. When they were swept away by the revolution of 1820 Spanish America was the poorer for their loss. The history of the Bethlehemites is but one of the instances of that heroic charity of the Catholic Church which she learned at the Crib and which in varying forms she has constantly practised for the welfare of humanity. The name of Pedro de Betancourt should not be forgotten. It is one of the noblest in the history of South America. The hallowed Christmas time gives a fitting opportunity to recall with gratitude his own virtues and the devotion and charity of his spiritual sons, the Brethren of Bethlehem.

## Literature

### A CALIFORNIA SOLDIER-BOY

"IF I should happen to get wiped out, . . . try and have a Roman Catholic Padre plant me . . . and please put after my name on the wooden cross the bare fact that I was an American." Thus, on August 20, 1916, the youthful hero of this new war-book, "Harry Butters, R.F.A." (Lane, \$1.50), wrote to the Anglican chaplain of his brigade and less than two weeks later the chaplain, C. H. Milner, wrote to the young hero's sister, Mrs. R. A. Bray, of Piedmont, Cal.: "Harry was buried this afternoon by a Roman Catholic Padre" and "at his request I shall see to it that on his cross it is stated that he was an American." "He was buried," adds the captain of his company, "beneath the Union Jack. We tried to get an American flag, but one was not procurable or he should have been honored by both countries."

This little tragedy—little in comparison with greater ones of daily occurrence—took place before America was in the war. Harry Butters could not wait for the call of his nation; he responded, with all the enthusiasm of his soul, to the call of the cause and for it he joyfully gave his life. There is another fact that explains his readiness to anticipate his own nation's call; he was a Beaumont boy and it was as such that he sought and obtained a commission in the English army. "I arrived at Beaumont," he writes in one of his letters, "at four in the afternoon and sent up my card to Father Carey (my old Master) and Captain Father Mayo (commanding the Officers' Training Corps). They both rushed down, delighted to see me—particularly Father Carey—and took me in to tea. 'Now,' says I, 'here I am. Came 7,000 miles of my own accord and it's up to you to find some way to get me the rest of the way to the front.'"

Beaumont College is a Jesuit institution, which had very little if any influence with the English Government authorities before the war, but during the great struggle she has won the respect of all parties by the generous loyalty of her old boys to the cause. On January 1, 1917, their record was as follows: Serving 509, killed 58, wounded, prisoners and missing 81, honors 135. What their record is now is not known to the present writer, but from the figures given it is easy to understand why Harry Butters applied to his alma mater when he sought admission into England's fighting legions. As a Beaumont boy he entered the service of England and served for one year, and as a Beaumont boy he gave up his young life when, shaken though he was by overwork and by shell-shock, he went up to the first line "to replace a casualty."

But as far as the practice of his religion is concerned, Harry Butters did not live as a Beaumont boy. He had, in fact, lost the faith in which he had been reared by a devout Catholic mother, in which he received special training, at Santa Clara College, in preparation for his First Communion, and in which he was further instructed by the English Jesuits at Beaumont. One might imagine that, on the eve of war, while associating with his old Beaumont masters, he would return to the Church, but there was some obstacle. "As for me," he writes to his sister, "the Church is far more impossible to return to today than it was the day I first left it, when I felt that I was no longer of its faith in articles of doctrine." The cause of Harry's fall from the Faith is not made clear in the narrative, nor was it the intention of the editor to discuss this phase of his life. But though the cause is not discussed, the fact is sufficiently evident and it is the fact that interests the present reviewer. It affords another instance of a soul won back to God by the dangers and horrors of war.

At home his sister prayed and prayed, while at the front her soldier-brother fought and fought not only against the Germans, but, perhaps, even against the grace of God, though all who knew Harry Butters will agree with those who say that it was but an unconscious resistance. The very soul of honesty in his dealings with his fellow-men, Harry cannot be pictured as dishonest, even in a small way, in his dealings with God, still he dropped away entirely from the practice of Catholicism and in spite of some very harrowing experiences of German shell-fire, his religious sense remained unassertive. "Men stand up to the strain of trench warfare in various ways," he tells his sister, "the strength of religion, lack of imagination, or natural phlegmatic temperament, a sense of humor and the ability to bluff one's self out of it. The last two are what have kept me going."

He was kept going for one year of active work on the line, but "his sense of humor and his ability to bluff himself" were put to some very serious tests and on August 22 we find him acknowledging that "to continue on in my battery" is "utterly beyond the strength that is in me." And then he adds with a touch of appreciation for his sister's religion: "I know that if I were as you are, I might be able to draw this courage from outside of me—in fact, from the Church."

It is a strange conversion; he goes back to the Church for courage in the midst of the dangers of war. "I went over and spent an afternoon with my dear friend Father Doyle and we went over it all. Before I left I even made my confession to

him for I earnestly craved help of God. And," he adds, "this is the place where the little item comes in that will please. I took my rosary to bed with me, night after night, and drew comfort and consolation from its simple beads. It seemed to link me with you—and with mother—and with that other Blessed Mother—that she and you have loved so well."

The letter was written on August 22. In it he tells of "another tragedy of the war." "Father Doyle is dead. Always in the front trenches when the shelling was heaviest, he was terribly wounded three days ago tending some of the dying.

God will certainly rest his soul, but his regiment will miss him sorely." It is not to be wondered at that such a self-sacrificing Catholic Padre could win Harry back to his old Mother Church. Twelve days after the writing of this letter, Harry himself fell, and we may say of him what he said of Father Doyle: "God will certainly rest his soul."

We have called attention to but one phase of this "brief record of a California boy who gave his life for England." It is a phase that by many may be overlooked because there is so much war-interest throughout. Besides the "Letters" from which we have quoted there is an admirably written sketch of Harry's "Life." It is from the pen of Mrs. Denis O'Sullivan, widow of the famous Irish singer of that name. Though brief, it reveals the character of young Butters in all its variety and nobility. The "Letters," written for the most part under pressure and sometimes to the sickening symphony of exploding German shells and the roar of English cannon, are not devoid of a literary merit of their own. Always full of vigor and enthusiasm, enlivened with sallies of wit, they sometimes, especially towards the end, rise to the importance of the situation and the young officer ventures even into the realm of the philosophical. Nor is he unmindful of the dangers which threaten: he seems even to have had a premonition of death, but "We are doing the world's work," he insists, "and I am in it to the finish."

D. J. KAVANAGH, S.J.

#### LITTLE NORRY SULLIVAN

Little Norry Sullivan, she's gone to join the nuns,  
Ain't it sthrange, the convent often gets the wildest ones?  
Makin' fun an' frolickin' you'll see thim here today,  
Look around tomorrow an', bedad, they're gone away!  
Gone away from all the fun,  
Gone away to be a nun,  
Faith, 'tis quare an' sthrange it is, achorra, as I say.

That's the kind that Norry was; a livelier never stept—  
Do you mind how fast she ran, how fearlessly she leapt?  
Everything her brothers did, 'twas she could do the same,  
(As for quiet Kevin, sure, she put the lad to shame.)  
Out she'd be from morn till night,  
Playin' ball was her delight,  
Norry's side was sure to win, whin she was in the game.

Man alive, but 'twas herself was just the merriest lass,  
Hardly could keep still while Father Toole was sayin' Mass;  
Thryin' hard to hold her eyes upon her little book,  
But the open window oft would lure her longin' look.  
Then you knew her mind had slipt  
From her prayer-book an' had skipt  
Out among the meadows in the softly-growing grass.

Sure, it seems like yesterday I saw her up an' down,  
Runnin' like a redshank through the streets o' Carrick Town.  
Double-knockin' people's doors an' pullin' people's bells,  
Makin' people nervous with her screeches an' her yells.  
But she's all grown up today,  
An' she's left an' gone away,  
Gone to be a Sisther in the convent down at Kells.

Wondher what came over her? Ah, sure, 'tis hard to know.  
This you may be certain, no one wanted her to go.  
Naither of the parents liked the step she took at all,  
An' there was one boy that felt as if he'd like to bawl.  
But 'twas Norry didn't mind;  
All their words were only wind;  
Said she had it in her heart an' must obey the call!

Little Norry Sullivan, God mark your soul to grace!  
Take my blessin' on your heart an' on your happy face!  
Take my blessin' on your work, an' on your prayin' too,  
On whatever task the Lord may give your hand to do.

An' whatever be His will,  
May your heart be merry still—  
Little Norry Sullivan, sure, that's my wish to you!

DENIS A. MCCARTHY.

#### REVIEWS

**The Hostage.** A Drama. By PAUL CLAUDEL. Translated from the French, with an Introduction by PIERRE CHAVANNES. New Haven: Yale University Press. \$1.50.

In a letter written to *Le Temps* the author of this powerful drama well observed: "The demands of Christianity . . . mutilate nothing . . . they appeal to the whole man, his intelligence, his will and his feelings; they compel us to be in a permanent state of mobilization against passion, against easy doubts and, for this perpetual war, we are not over-endowed with all our faculties." That truth is demonstrated with tremendous cogency in "The Hostage," which is probably the greatest work M. Claudel has as yet produced. For dramatic intensity, forceful characterization, sustained loftiness of thought and poetic beauty of language it is probable that few plays by moderns can approach the excellence of this masterpiece. Those who wish to see with what consummate skill a Catholic author can use Catholic material to produce a Catholic play should not fail to read "The Hostage."

The scene of the drama is laid in France, not long before Napoleon's fall. In the first act Sygne de Coufontaine is introduced, pledging her fealty to her cousin George, to whom she hands over the ancestral domains she has at last bought back from the revolutionists. George, an unbeliever, a royalist and an outlaw, has delivered Pope Pius from Napoleon's prison and brought him to the old Cistercian abbey, which is the only building left standing of the Coufontaine estates. The Holy Father's hiding place is discovered by Turelure, the low-born Prefect of the Marne, who demands Sygne's hand as the price of his connivance at the Pope's presence in the abbey. In the second act Father Badilon, Sygne's confessor, persuades her to marry the prefect in order to save Pope Pius. He says:

To save the Father of all men, according to the call that has come to you, may you renounce your love, your name, your cause and your honor in this world, embracing your executioner and accepting him as husband even as Christ allowed Judas to partake of His body . . . Father, Thou seest this lamb who has done what she could. Take compassion on her now, and lay not upon her an unbearable burden. Have mercy too on me, priest and sinner, who with my own hands have just sacrificed to Thee my only child. And you, my daughter, say that you forgive me before I forgive you.

In the third act Sygne has become the wife of Turelure, now prefect of the Seine, and defender of Paris against the Allies, and is killed by a bullet shot by her cousin George, but meant for her husband. Father Badilon is with her as she dies, and just succeeds in getting her to forgive Turelure as she breathes her last. It is an interesting fact that in the acting version of the play Claudel completely altered that scene, making Turelure rouse his dying wife to forgive him by calling out the motto of her

house: "*Coufontaine, adsum!*" Let the reader judge which ending is the more effective. The translation seems well done, for the most part, but Catholics do not speak of the "Sacraments" of the Holy Eucharist, and, as a rule, they say "Mass," not "the Mass." In his introduction, Pierre Chavannes well shows how the theme of "The Hostage" is a dramatic conflict of conscience, but, in trying to explain the character of Claudel's Catholicism, he is far from satisfactory. W. D.

**Psychology.** General Introduction. By CHARLES HUBBARD JUDD. Second Completely Revised Edition. Boston: Ginn & Co. \$1.80.

The author of this volume has demonstrated his continued ability to write books on the science of the soul, with the soul left out. The treatise is entirely and professedly empirical, and so far good. But the contention with which the book closes, that psychology is most intimately and inseparably connected with philosophy, seems to be in little accord with what had gone before. In his painstaking and laudable endeavor to express the physiological conditions of thought, the author has neglected the all-important psychological causes of thought. And it is the causes that the scientist seeks, much more in a science that is intimately bound up with philosophy.

The fundamental dogma underlying the whole work is the assumption of the evolution of human consciousness from animal sensation. We are led along the ordinary path through the gradually ascending scale of brute intelligence until we come to the fatal leap to ideation, and there we are left in the dark during that all-important instant, biologically speaking, while our primordial ancestor is making his lightning change into a man. Although the author elsewhere exhibits a fund of esoteric information about our presumed distant relations, at this point he is at a loss to explain the evolution of ideas and speech; and is satisfied with muddling hurriedly through a paragraph interspersed with various gratuitous "it must be's" and "we may assume's" until he emerges once more complacently into the light, seemingly innocent of the fact that he had passed over the one point where his whole theory of ideation must rest.

Apart from the fact that this psychologist has written 350 pages on the subject without one mention of the word "soul" or any of its equivalents, and has based his whole treatise on an inexplicable, unfounded and exploded assumption, there are many well-put and interesting chapters, especially on the functional view of the lower forms of mental life. But considered as a profound and penetrating study of human consciousness, as compared with Father Maher's work on the same subject, Professor Judd's "Psychology" is like a loosely written and superficially reasoned primer. W. H. G.

**Life and Literature.** By LAFCADIO HEARN. Selected and Edited with an Introduction by JOHN ERSKINE, Ph.D., Professor of English in Columbia University. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. \$3.50.

The twenty-three lectures in this volume were carefully taken down by Lafcadio Hearn's Japanese pupils, as he slowly explained to them his idea of the nature of literature, the function of criticism, the art of composition and the way to read modern authors appreciatively. The best chapters in the book are those in which he tells his hearers how to read, compose and criticize, and they will be found valuable by teachers of English. Speaking as he was to Japanese students, who were not familiar with Western literature, Hearn took pains to be very clear and to explain carefully every point he touched on. In his lecture "On Reading in Relation to Literature" the author well says: "The test of a great book is whether we want to read it only once or more than once. . . . A book that a person of education and good taste does not care to read more than once is very probably not worth much." In his lecture on "Composition" there are some

good pages emphasizing the importance of taking time and pains, if anything really worth while is to be written. From many of the other lectures in "Life and Literature" Hearn's unsophisticated hearers must have inferred that to be a discerning critic it is necessary to reject Christianity as he did. He warns them, for instance, that "A pious Roman Catholic may not find beauty in a thing not written according to the medieval spirit of the religion to which he belongs." He lamentably misleads his helpless pupils, too, when he undertakes to explain "the war between the Jesuits and Port Royal." Herbert Spencer was Hearn's idol, and that now-discredited "philosopher's" influence is discernible throughout this volume. W. D.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The system of belief or morals that hopes to compete with Christianity must make itself comprehensible to the common mind. That even theosophy is endeavoring to meet this need by means of popular manuals appears in Michael J. Whitty's "A Simple Study in Theosophy" (Kennerly). Its case, however, is more clearly than convincingly stated in the present volume. The arguments with which the author proposes to support Madame Blavatsky's "more full and more reasonable explanation of the great questions 'why, whence and whither,'" are too weak to bear even forcible statement, much less examination. This weakness appears not only in such patent falsehoods as the assertion that Origen's heresy of reincarnation, though condemned by the Second Council of Constantinople, "was part of the teaching of early Christianity," but it shows itself no less clearly in the lame attempt to support the doctrine of "Karma," or the natural retribution of moral reaction, by appealing to a psychic inheritance which must for that purpose be restricted to the immediate parents alone. So, too, the average man will find it difficult to see how his will can be free to determine the conditions of a future life on earth, and at the same time absolutely helpless to modify the conditions of a present one; and the natural consequence in practice will probably be what Professor James delicately termed "a moral holiday."

In the seven papers which Mr. Henry Van Dyke, until recently our Minister to Holland, has brought together in a volume entitled "Fighting for Peace" (Scribner, \$1.25) there is little that is new regarding the war. He tells about the mysterious difficulty he had during the spring of 1914 in interesting Germany in the Hague Peace Tribunal, describes how he helped American and Belgian refugees when the great conflict began, reviews the record of Germany's broken pledges, tortuous diplomacy, and ruthless methods of warfare, and indicates by means of allegories what his opinion is of the Kaiser.—Captain Gilbert Nobbs' "On the Right of the British Line" (Scribner, \$1.25) is a plain and vivid account of his experiences at the front from the time of his leaving England through the heroic days on the Somme till his frightful suffering as he lay blind and abandoned in a shell-hole in No Man's Land. For months he was given up as dead; his days in German prison camps are faithfully described and his return on exchange to his native land.

"The Green Mirrors" (Doran, \$1.50), by Hugh Walpole, is a psychological study of a family, hidebound in the extreme insularity of English ancestral traditions. A young man, thoroughly imbued with the modern spirit, enters the charmed circle, wins the love of the eldest daughter, and by his infusion of the new ideas forces the family to readjust their notions to changing conditions. The story is well and carefully told, and takes on the character of an allegory, foretelling the changes which the author thinks England must inevitably adopt in her attitude towards other nations and modern life.—That Indians have not ceased to be interesting, two new books for boys

prove: "The White Blanket" (Putnam, \$1.25), by. Belmore Browne, and "The Blue Heron's Feather" (Lippincott, \$1.25), by Rupert Sargent Holland. The former tells of Indians in modern Alaska, the latter of those original Americans in old New Netherland, and they both inculcate that interest in the great outdoors that Captain Scott so wanted for his boy. The "White Blanket" is full of snow-covered areas, diamond glaciers, ice-mountains, and all the frozen mysteries of the North; "The Blue Heron's Feather" describes wooded tracts and running waters nearer home. In the former, by an Indian's aid, some boys go on an adventurous hunt for gold and also meet with hearts of gold. In the latter a Dutch boy, again by an Indian's aid, succeeds in uniting the Mohawks and the Netherlanders, thus averting bloodshed and teaching by example the lesson of forbearance and respect for others' rights.

"Mary, Mary," "Rothschild's Fiddle," "A Hazard of New Fortunes" are three elegant and tastefully bound books from the "Modern Library" of Boni and Liveright (\$0.60 each). In the first, James Stephens sketches the fortunes of Mary Makebelieve, the poor little Dublin drudge, and her doting and idealistic mother, with genial humor and pathos. Stephens knows his dear old Dublin well and loves its people. The author of "Rothschild's Fiddle," the physician-novelist, Anton Chekov, is said to be one of the masters of the Russian short story. He has the gift of keeping his readers puzzled and of filling in his canvas with quick, broad strokes. But there is too much black in the picture. There is something depressing and morbid in the general atmosphere of the stories, too much of the physician diagnosing and analyzing his case. If the picture of Russian society drawn by the writer is a true one, we can understand something of the kaleidoscopic changes which have lately taken place in his native land. Now and then a tender note comes into the work of the story-teller reminding us that he felt for the suffering of his people. The reprint of "A Hazard of New Fortunes" shows William Dean Howells in some of his best qualities. The book has been called the most "important" of the author's works. In it Howells shows that he had foreseen, though dimly perhaps, some of the great social problems which our new democracy would soon have to face. Viewed in this light, the novel, though suffering from the limitations of its author, will prove interesting to those who like to study the problems of today in their earlier symptoms. Mr. Howells is undoubtedly a literary artist. He sees things clearly and makes his characters speak and act as we can imagine they would do in real life, without affectation or unnatural posing.

The December *Month*, which was slow to reach this country, opens with a most interesting article by Father Martindale on "St. John of the Cross," there are papers on the novels of Mon-signori Bickerstaffe-Drew and Benson, and on the text "As Little Children," there is a Christmas poem, of which the first two stanzas are these:

And every year when Christ doth come:  
A little Babe from Heav'n above—  
So helplessly in need of home,  
So innocently sure of love;  
I think the silent child that sleeps  
In every soul—with some sweet mood  
Of sympathy—awakes and leaps  
In answer to His Babyhood.

Then we would make a holy game  
Of all that happened long ago;  
With cave and manger just the same,  
And cotton wool for winter snow;  
And tinsel star, and paper hay,  
And kings and shepherds—all of them—  
Surely to God who loves us so,  
We are as little ones at play,  
Who take each other's hands and say:—  
"Oh! Let's pretend it's Bethlehem."

## EDUCATION

### The Management of Parochial Schools

IT is a more or less culpable defect in our present conception of the parochial-school system that we seem to consider inevitable the lack of schools in the smaller parishes whose financial resources are insufficient to permit the maintenance of a school.

Our practice is quite inconsistent with our principles. The parochial school system is founded on the principle that the parish school is necessary for the preservation of Catholic faith in the majority of the coming generation. Nevertheless, our practice today permits a large proportion of the children of Catholic parents to be deprived of the essential benefits of a Catholic school.

#### NOT A LOCAL INTEREST

STATISTICIANS warn us that approximately one-third of the children of Catholic parents in this country reside in districts where, under present requirements, it seems impossible for the local parish authorities to maintain a school. The resultant loss to the Faith is not merely a local loss, a loss to the parish only; it is a loss to the diocese, and to the universal Church, as well. Yet we continue to consider the school question in such parishes a purely local problem, and to visit the responsibility for its solution upon the hapless pastor, as though he alone were affected by the loss or gain of souls to the Faith in his vicinity. Our principles demand that this, to him, insuperable burden, be lifted from the conscience of the local pastor, and placed where it rightfully belongs, in the keeping of the diocese.

#### AN OUTWORN POLICY

OUR parochial-school system, in its present form, is an inheritance from the pioneer past. In the days of its origin, when all the nascent parishes had similar physical needs to be provided for out of approximately equal incomes, it was necessary and just that each parish should depend upon its own resources. The continuance of that policy today, operates to deprive the smaller parishes of schools, although physical conditions in the larger parishes warrant the adoption of a policy quite the reverse, and more in accordance with the beneficent principle of Christian unity upon which the whole Catholic edifice is reared.

Today organized co-operation takes the place of independent effort. In other fields, particularly in works of charity, diocesan organizations of more effective scope usurp the place and do the work of the old societies, whose activities were confined to their own parish limits. But the schools remain today, practically as they were in the beginning. There has been, indeed, a certain increase of diocesan supervision, but what we have erroneously called a "system" of schools continues to be only a series of sternly independent parochial units, limited in each case by all the limitations, financial, temperamental, and otherwise, of the pastor and his parish.

The many and grave handicaps in the cause of Catholic education, inherent in this state of affairs, indicate the wisdom of a change. If we are to realize to the full, the purpose of the parochial schools it is inevitable that the diocese shall adopt its many separate schools, embody them in a tangible, practicable system, under an authoritative head and assume, together with the direction of their educational activities, the responsibility for their finances.

#### SUGGESTED CHANGES

THE essential outline of the executive organization that would be necessary under diocesan administration, is clearly visible in the forces that operate our schools today, while the personnel of the new organization could be made practically identical with that of the old. The burden of expense would continue to be borne by the parishes, but by all the parishes of the diocese without ex-

ception. The disbursement of funds, however, under the plan proposed, would become the province of the Bishop, or his representative School Board, rather than of the local pastors as at present. It would thus be possible for the diocese to provide funds not only for the maintenance of schools already existing, as it does in effect today, but also to establish schools in the smaller parishes where they are necessary, but under present conditions, altogether lacking. Other desired improvements in the school system would result automatically under diocesan administration. Probably increased expense would also result, but not in greater measure than our educational responsibilities warrant, and consequently, such expense should not prohibit the adoption of the plan suggested.

That difficulties exist in the way of its adoption cannot be gainsaid, but merely to propose a difficulty is no proof of impracticability. Indeed, it is safe to say that no objection to the plan can be proposed that cannot be satisfactorily answered. In the last analysis, it is nothing more than a wise application to the parochial-school system, by the diocese, of the methods used by the State in the support of the public-school system.

OWEN J. KIRBY.

## SOCIOLOGY

### Lying and Society

NOT so long ago the newspapers reported that a certain minister of the Gospel informed his congregation that, upon occasions, it is lawful to tell a lie. He seemed to think, for instance, that it would be justifiable to lie in order to save a woman's honor. Half the difficulties of life come from a misunderstanding; and more than half the misunderstandings come from the lack of a good definition. If the gentleman in question had taken the trouble to set down clearly what a lie is, and had further thought what the act of lying implies, he would hardly have made the statement attributed to him. Unless we begin with a definition, we can have no common starting point, no rendezvous where our arguments meet and compare merits. We may dispute with much ado, and at any length, but the result will be very like that of an orchestra when there is a divergence of opinion among the players as to the next number on the program.

### WHAT IS A LIE?

NOW, as commonly, and indeed properly, understood, a lie is not the same as a false statement. Harold, let us say, has visited New York for the first time. In his account of the wonders he has seen, he places the Public Library on Fifth Avenue at Forty-Third Street, because he believes the building stands there. No one would accuse Harold of lying. None the less, he has made a false statement. But it was not wilfully false, and that makes all the difference in the world. We say Harold has made a mistake, not that he lied. He had not one thing in his mind, and another on his lips. His utterance does not contradict his thought. He is in like case with the novice in arithmetic who writes that  $7 + 5 = 11$ . It is simply a blunder. It is false, but not a lie.

A lie, then, is a statement which the speaker believes to be false, but which he deliberately utters as true. His intellect conceives the reality to be affirmative, yet he wilfully declares that his concept of the fact is negative, or vice versa. His intellect declares that the case is thus and so. His will commands a denial of what his intellect believes and inwardly asserts. There is a contradiction, therefore, between the inner word of the mind and the outward utterance of the lips; so that intellect and will are opposed, the one pitted against the other.

### INTELLECT AND WILL

THE intellect may be termed the eye that guides man in his rational actions. And just as a man of ordinary prudence uses his eyes to direct his footsteps, and guard himself against

unnecessary risks, so in matters of the mind does his intellect examine the move he would make, and conclude whether he may wisely start or continue. "Safety first" is a sound principle in every business. Is there a street to be crossed? The eye takes in the situation, the intellect decides "It is safe" or "It is unsafe." The will commands "Go ahead," or "Wait," as the case may be. Is it an investment to be made? The mind's eye, the intellect, reviews the market, reckons the capital on hand, the expenditure called for, the chances for profit or loss, and *sees* whether it is well to proceed or better to withhold action. The will then issues the *fiat*, "Buy," or "Sell," or "Stand Pat."

### A PERVERSION OF NATURE

WHENCE it appears clearly enough that normally the intellect and will are intended to act together in concert; and that the opposite procedure is abnormal and directly opposed to the intent of nature itself. For we do not strive after knowledge merely for the sake of knowing but in order to attain some further end, to gratify some desire, to sate some yearning. The financier studies the stock market not merely to know what is going on, but that he may the better direct his own activities, and add to his gains. Even in matters of art, we wish to acquire knowledge of pictures and other art objects, in order to cultivate and gratify our esthetic sense. Once more, then, it is clear that our nature calls for unity of action between intellect and will; and that whatever perverts this order and hinders this cooperation is against the demands of our rational nature. This is one element in the sin of lying, the will denies what the intellect affirms. Faculties destined by nature to be helpmeets, are set one against the other. There is a perversion of our natural powers. It is the sin of dividing brethren of one household.

### MAN'S SOCIAL NATURE

AN intelligent workman examines his tools, and considers the purpose for which each is intended and fitted. He will not try to turn screws with a highly tempered chisel, or to carve with a screwdriver. We must apply to speech the principle herein involved. All experience proves that man is forcefully drawn to live in company with his fellows. He needs their aid. He cannot properly develop his faculties alone. To get assistance from others, to cooperate with them, he must communicate his thoughts to them in some way; and the instrument which nature has given for this purpose is speech. If the purpose of speech were to conceal thought, words would become but a meaningless jumble of sounds, and nature would have made a sad and irremediable mistake. For everyone knows how hard it is to keep a secret, and how often and how easily one is betrayed by words, even while trying hardest at concealment. A ready example is had in the case of criminals who so often unwittingly confess what they are most anxious to hide. If nature intended that our thoughts should be concealed, it would have made us as dumb as stones.

### A SIN AGAINST SOCIETY

FINALLY, admit the principle that lying is sometimes licit, and what will result? No one will implicitly believe another. The liar is always caught in the long run. Let a man be ever so reputable, if once convicted of lying, he loses caste. Admit that it is ever lawful to lie, and mutual trust and fidelity will go for nothing, because no one will be able to know when his neighbor will not say to himself: "In this case I am justified in telling a deliberate falsehood." It is true that there are secrets we are bound to keep, but that is a further question. Lying is always a poor, as well as an illicit, escape from a difficulty. Every lie is a sin against our rational nature, against the purpose for which the power of speech was given us, against society at large.

F. J. McNIFF, S.J.

## NOTE AND COMMENT

## Decline of the Press

WRITING in the January *Atlantic* on "Press Tendencies and Dangers," Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard finds that "The decreasing number of newspapers in our large cities is due to the enormously increased cost of maintaining great dailies." He asserts that one New York paper cheerfully loses some \$500,000 every year, calls attention to the fact that cities as big as Cleveland, Indianapolis, Detroit, St. Paul and New Orleans have only one morning paper each, and quotes "Ayer's Newspaper Directory" to prove that during the past three years 300 weeklies, semi-weeklies and tri-weeklies have discontinued publication, and that 76 dailies died peaceful deaths since January 1, 1917. Mr. Villard notes a growing tendency to group together a number of papers under one ownership, and an increasing distrust of the press on the part of the people, because the leading papers seem to set forth the views only of capitalists and the privileged classes. Certainly the results of the recent mayoralty contest in New York show that the power of the metropolitan press is not what it once was. Catholics should make it a religious duty to see that, owing to the lack of generous support, none of our diocesan weeklies ceases publication in these trying times.

## Keep the Old Resolutions

STUDENTS of human nature have observed that most men pay but scant attention to the really important things of life but devote by far the greater part of their time, means and energy to what is of little moment. When it is considered how much of the average man's life is passed in amusement, in self-indulgence, in adorning and pampering his body, but what little pains he takes to train his mind, cultivate his taste, keep his heart clean and his soul strong, it is clear that the less-important things of life are his chief concern. While complaining of life's brevity we act as if we were to live here forever; while discanting on the necessity of dying well, we defer till the latest moment doing what will help us make a good end; we believe that faith, contrition, purity and lowliness are the warring Christian's best weapons, but we walk with eyes wide open into familiar temptations and rush all unarmed into well-known occasions of sin, where the enemy easily conquers our weak resistance. Most of AMERICA's readers have no doubt already made what seems to be an altogether fresh set of New Year's resolutions, which have actually lasted unbroken, perhaps, until now. But, on closer examination, these high resolves of 1918 will probably be found to be quite the same as those we took last year, the year before that and even the year before that. So we need only to realize that old weaknesses are with us still and to pray confidently for the grace to avoid, with more success during the coming year, the old occasions of sin.

## Three Distinguished Educators

THE hand of the Lord has been heavy on the Maryland-New York Province of the Society of Jesus during the past few weeks. Three of its most distinguished members have been called from their earthly labors into their eternal rest. All three were well on in years, but their active service seemed to be far from finished. The Rev. John D. Whitney, S.J.; the Rev. Michael A. O'Kane, S.J., and the Rev. John Scully, S.J., the first named of whom died several weeks ago, and the other

two on the same day, December 26, were all rectors of Jesuit colleges, all added or completed important groups to the buildings of the institutions they directed, and all lived to see them develop beyond their fondest expectations. Father O'Kane's memory is perpetuated at Holy Cross College by the O'Kane building; Father Scully, in the words of his successor, left the record of his presidency at Fordham written in monuments of stone. Father Whitney's life ran out, as was fitting in the case of an ex-naval officer and a native of Nantucket, with the ebb of the tide, and took place in New England, of which he was one of the most distinguished scions by reason both of lineage and achievement. Father Scully died in New York, his native State, where he gave the best years of his life to education and to the upbuilding of the Shrine at Auriesville. His death cut short his aspirations to go to France as a chaplain, a post for which his military character, his zeal and his knowledge of languages especially fitted him. Father O'Kane, also, died under the shadow of the great building which his own initiative and courage had raised, and his last words were uttered in the very city where the golden stream of his eloquence, known throughout the eastern States, first compelled attention. They were three typical Jesuits, pioneers in a sense, tirelessly zealous, strong, kindly, distinguished.

## Jubilee of a Danish Bishop

ON September 8, 1917, the Rt. Rev. Johannes von Euch celebrated his silver jubilee as Bishop of Denmark, where from the year of his ordination, in 1860, he has exercised his exalted mission as a priest. Bishop von Euch, who is by birth a German and received ordination in Osnabrück, during his long residence in the capital of Denmark has become one of the most honored men in Copenhagen. A striking figure among the Catholic clergy of today, with eighty-three years behind him, his energy appears unabated and his care for his flock undiminished. When he arrived at Copenhagen fifty-three years ago, there were but two Catholic churches in the whole country; today there is scarcely a city without one. The secular priests are assisted in the diocesan work by a number of Orders, among them Jesuits, Franciscans, Redemptorists, Lazarists and others. Teaching Brothers assist the Fathers in the school work and seven congregations of Sisters are kept busy in the classrooms and in the hospitals, where their work is much appreciated and carries with it a notable percentage of conversions.

On his arrival he found a people, bitterly opposed to Catholicism. The entire Catholic population did not number over 800 souls, drawn mostly from the foreign embassies; and the bitterly fought war between Denmark and Germany, 1863-64, did not add to his comforts, but Father von Euch was a priest and not a politician, and as the years passed he grew in popularity. He was eminently fitted for his post, and, when Prince Waldemar of Denmark later married the Catholic Princess, Marie of the House of Bourbon, Father von Euch found a powerful ally, who, like himself, was armed with extraordinary personality and took the Danish hearts by storm. From that period on the success of the Catholic cause rapidly increased. As usual the Church, so wrongly accused of fostering crass ignorance, appealed to the intelligent classes, who found in Mgr. von Euch a man of singular attainment and rare talent; prominent laymen soon yielded him support, and one of his staunchest supporters is the Danish author, Johannes Jorgensen, well known to American Catholics through translations of some of his numerous works. In 1892 in recognition of the advancement of the Catholic Church in Denmark, chiefly owing to the efforts of Mgr. von Euch, the prefecture of Denmark was raised to a bishopric, and Johannes von Euch was consecrated at Osnabrück the first Bishop of the Danish See after a lapse of over 300 years.